-P
5013
350
.9

Queen's University
Library

KINGSTON, ONTARIO

METHODISM UNMASKED,

IN A REVIEW

OF

"A Vindication of the Methodist Church"

(SO CALLED,)

"IN A PASTORAL ADDRESS,"

"BY BENJAMIN NANKEVILL, WESLEYAN MINISTER."

BY J. A. MULOCK,

PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

CARLETON PLACE, C. W.:
PRINTED BY SMITH & OSWELL, OGDENSBURGH, N. Y.

1850.

L
F1028
1850M9

CARLETON PLACE, March 21st, 1850.

REV. SIR:—

We, the undersigned, Churchwardens of your several Churches, being much grieved and offended at the gross perversion of truth and the great want of even common honesty, displayed in an "Address" of Mr. Nankeville, Methodist Preacher, wherein we fear he has designedly slandered both the Church of England and yourself, having heard your refutation of said "Address," showing modern Methodism to be at variance with the Bible, the Primitive Church, the Church of England, and Mr. Wesley, think the publication of it would be productive of much good, and request that you will be kind enough to consent thereto, by which you will much oblige your slandered Parishioners.

(Signed) JAS. ROSAMOND,
HENRY HAWKINS,
JOHN HALPENNY,
ABRAHAM CODD,
JOHN BOLAND,
RICHARD COLLINS.

The Rev. John A. Mulock.

77907

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAP. 1.—Confirmation.

" 2.—The Church of England before the Reformation.

" 3.—Supposed Ordination of Dr. Coke.

" 4.—Supposed Ordination of Mr. Asbury.

" 5.—That the General Conference held at Baltimore did not AT THAT TIME UNANIMOUSLY receive Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury Bishops.

" 6.—Supposed Ordinations for England.

" 7.—Supposed Ordinations for Scotland.

" 8.—Episcopacy.

" 9.—Apostolic Succession.

" 10.—Testimonies in favor of the foregoing.

" 11.—Bishops and Presbyters not the same Order.

" 12.—The necessary Erudition of a Christian man.

" 13.—Licensing of John Morrison.

" 14.—A charge of falsehood.

" 15.—Wesley not a Dissenter.

" 16.—The force of Prejudice.

" 17.—Prejudiced and unprejudiced estimation of the Book of Common Prayer.

" 18.—Numerical strength no proof of a true Church.

" 19.—Wesley a Churchman.

" 20.—The early Methodist Preachers and the decisions of Conference.

" 21.—Church and State.

" 22.—Schism.

" 23.—Popery outstripped.

CONCLUSION.

INTRODUCTION.

The better to understand the following remarks, and to arrive at *correct ideas* as to the origin of the controversy between the Methodists and myself, it will be necessary to take a retrospective view, and trace the matter to its first and moving cause.

The Bishop of Toronto having signified his intention of visiting my parish for the purpose of holding confirmation, I conceived it my duty to explain the nature of that apostolic and scriptural rite, and to press upon my hearers the necessity of real, vital, personal religion. My object in this was twofold. 1st, to remind those who had already been confirmed, of the solemn vows which they then took, and of the obligations consequent thereon, to "live righteously, soberly and godly, in this present world;"—to warn the old and grey-headed that their time on earth was short,—that a reckoning would soon be made with them, when they would have to give a faithful account of the deeds done in the flesh, whether they be good or whether they be evil. 2dly, to explain to those who were about to be confirmed, the meaning and origin of the ceremony;—the preparation necessary to be made to become worthy participators;—the motives by which they should be influenced;—the duties to which they would be bound;—the obligatory nature of its requirements, and the blessings that might be expected by those who entered upon it with a pure and undivided heart. In prosecuting the subject after giving extracts from Scripture, and from some of the early christians, as well as from the Reformers, I mentioned the names of Adam Clark and John Wesley, and gave a few quotations from the latter, to show the estimation in which he held this ordinance of the Church of his vows,—the Church of England. "Here is the head and front of my offending,"—here is the cause of all the lying, slander, and evil speaking, poured upon the head of one, unconscious of the hostility which his conduct was about to provoke. In my discourse I made not one remark to hurt the feelings of any individual. I passed no comment upon the words of Mr. Wesley, and concluded by inviting in the kindest and most christian manner the Methodists who were not confirmed to avail themselves of this opportunity of uniting themselves to the Church of their Founder.

To my great surprise on returning home upon the following day from a distant part of my mission, I was stopped on the road by a leader of the Methodist connexion and charged with "attacking their body and giving extracts, as from Mr. Wesley, which he never uttered." On being asked for those extracts, I at once dismounted, tied my horse to the fence, entered the house and handed him my Sermon. I remained an hour and twenty minutes, and on Mr. Stephenson taking what he required and expressing himself satisfied, he returned me the Sermon. Being in a great hurry, yet wishing to give all the satisfaction in my power, I proposed to read it, telling him at the same time to stop me whenever I came to any part which he might desire, to add to the extracts he had already taken.—Upon concluding, I asked him whether he needed anything more, and being answered in the negative, and thanked for my kindness, I mounted my horse, and proceeded homewards congratulating myself with the hope, that anything like misrepresentation would now be checked. Judge my surprise at being told before the week was out, that I had refused the extracts referred to, together with other falsehoods, which, as they concern myself personally, are unworthy of further notice.

The conclusion drawn by the Methodists from this false report was this; "That had I preached the truth, I need not be ashamed of it, and that my refusal was a proof that the truth was not in me." On the following Sunday I mentioned the falsehood before the congregation, giving notice at the same time, that I would preach the same Sermon, in the same church, D. V., on that day three weeks, when any individual wishing extracts from it might have them. On the Sunday after, I repeated the notice, expressing my desire that some of the Methodists would accept my offer and judge for themselves. After service on another Sunday I proffered in person anything in my sermon to the afore named individual in presence of a number of people; upon which one of the advocates of Methodism said "no gentleman can do more."

The notified Sunday having arrived, I preached the sermon, supposing that at this time all misapprehension would be removed; but to my astonishment the clouds only thickened, and where one falsehood was told before, ten were told then. Being determined that

"my good should not be evil spoken of," I preached the same sermon in my churches on *seven* different Sundays, always giving a fortnight's notice at least, and expressing my willingness to give extracts to any individual.

Such frank and open conduct, one might have supposed, would have disarmed my enemies and put the lying lips to silence; but no; it was turned to my reproach, and not satisfied with secret malice, I was openly attacked in my church, even before the congregation had dispersed, and in the most uncourteous language, charged with falsehood upon the steps of that sacred building. All this I bore quietly, and on the following Wednesday having repaired to my church, according to notice, to examine and prepare candidates for Confirmation, the first person who presented himself before me was the aforesaid redoubtable champion of schism, prepared for the attack and armed with sundry tracts, and the "Centenary of Methodism." Having declined any controversy with this person, he handed me a letter of the most insulting kind, to be perused at my leisure.

Notwithstanding all this provocation, I held my peace until my forbearance was misconstrued into a fear of the weakness of my cause. For upwards of three years had I been laboring in this parish, during which time I never mentioned even the name of Methodism, nor should I have done so to this day, had I been suffered to pursue my course in peace, and to instruct those committed to my charge in the rites and doctrines of our most holy faith; but when our pure and apostolic Church was assailed—when the rite of confirmation was declared popish and unscriptural—when the candidates for that rite were called hypocrites, and myself branded as a Puseyite; I conceived longer silence on my part would be criminal, and stood on the defensive. Judge then from this the truth of Mr. Nankeville's assertion, that I have "drawn the sword without provocation or cause."

Could I, I would ask with the vows of ordination upon me to give a "faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word," suffer our church to be maligned, her usages traduced, her doctrines falsified, her children vilified, her ministers aspersed without raising my voice, however feeble in their vindication? Would it be proper for me, one of her accredited Ministers, to sit calmly by while the spoiler was at work; and yet we are told of the "*wanton and unprovoked attacks of the Rev. Mr. Mulock.*"

In the "Introduction" to his "address" Mr. Nankeville "feels somewhat surprised at the *attack of the Rev. Mr. Mulock;* for this reason, he was professing a great deal of friendship for me, at the time of the *attack.*" When, where or to whom, I would ask, did I ever speak an unkind word of that individual, until my character was assailed, and my veracity impeached, and that before his whole congregation? When, I repeat; I ask for proof,—I demand it, So far from that being the case; on two evenings before "*his* wanton and unprovoked attack" upon my character, we parted with mutual expressions of friendship, and a most wicked falsehood having been studiously circulated of me; and Mr. Nankeville having been stated as the author of it, I *repeated* on the Sunday previous to his attack, before my whole congregation, "That I considered it a libel upon his character, as I conceived him a christian man and a gentleman, and that he would suffer his right hand to be cut off sooner than utter a falsehood;" and yet this individual makes a personal attack upon my honor and honesty, declaring in the same breath that he "respects me as a friend." Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.*

To follow this individual through his erratic course in the fifty six pages of his address, would occupy not only a quarto volume, but would take at the least two years of research; for the most casual observer will see that his object was to puzzle rather than to edify, and so satisfactorily has he succeeded that in every instance, where he has attempted his puerile argument he has puzzled himself, and made his trumpet to give an uncertain sound. But as this vindicator of Methodism has seldom informed us whence he took his extracts it cannot be expected that I should rebut them singly. Nevertheless, I have discovered a few of them, and I grieve to say that every discovery thus made tends to justify the charge

---

* Wishing as much as possible to avoid personalities in this Review, I have refrained from refuting the various falsehoods relative to myself contained in the "vindication." The following notices read in my congregation on on two Sundays previous to the appointed meeting before a large body of Methodists, together with Mr. Nankeville's brother preacher on this circuit, will I trust render further explanation needless.

"Having twice in person called upon Mr. Nankeville to meet me on the subject of certain gross falsehoods relative to myself for which he has been given as author, and he having declined, I now call upon him through you of the Methodist Society, to meet me on Thursday, the 14th inst., at 12 o'clock, in Carleton Place, to answer such charges as I shall bring against him. The place of meeting may be chosen by himself, and he is at liberty to have present whomsoever he chooses.

"I hereby pronounce the various extracts in Mr. Nankeville's 'vindication' to be either wilful falsehoods or gross misrepresentations, and I call upon him to meet me at the aforesaid time and place to substantiate his assertions."

Both of these invitations were declined.

On three successive Sundays I took the original works of Wesley, Asbury, minutes of Conference, Burnett, Buchanan's Christian Researches, &c., &c., to the churches under my care, and called upon the Methodists to come forward and examine for themselves, or to appoint a deputation to wait on me, on any given day, to whom I would go through the whole of the Review, and point out to them the page from whence every extract was taken; but they declined doing so, taking for granted that the extracts were correct.

of misrepresentation on my opponent, which I shall have no difficulty in proving as I proceed.

During the progress of his address, he has lavished a copious supply of scurrility and abuse upon me, your appointed Pastor ("Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,") but "none of these things move me." Such language is only calculated to excite disgust—such arrows fall to the ground "pointless and harmless." Abuse is the refuge of ignorance, the privilege of the base, and never yet have I seen it indulged in unless where truth and argument were wanting.

"The present age," says Mr. N., "seems full of enterprise; and persons are not satisfied to take things up on trust. Reason is not to be put off with bare assertions. No; men will examine for themselves." Why did not that individual give us a little of that *proof* which he conceives so necessary?—why has he confined himself, almost exclusively, to "bare assertions?" I answer, because he could not—because the truth was not in him. He preferred abuses and invective, supposing such to be more palatable to his hearers; in which, I am happy to say, he has been disappointed.

CHAPTER I.

CONFIRMATION.

It is a point beyond all doubt that confirmation has been practiced in the Church of God from the times of the apostles. Its origin is supposed to have been derived from a custom handed down among the Jews, as mentioned by Josephus, of bringing their children to the house of God, at the age of thirteen years, to be publicly examined before the congregation; upon which occasion, if they acquitted themselves well, they were then declared to be "children of the precept," when they pledged themselves in the most solemn manner to keep the law, and be answerable for their sins; after which engagement followed the prayers of the congregation that God would enable them to keep their promise.

The correspondence between this, and the practice existing among us is obvious—nevertheless we take higher ground for this rite. To the law and to the testimony. In the 8th of Acts we are told that Phillip, one of the first deacons, preached the gospel to the Samaritans and baptized those by whom it was embraced. At this time the apostles were remaining at Jerusalem, and when they heard that the Samaritans had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they come down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet he had fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; then laid they their hands upon them and they received the Holy Ghost." Again, in the 19th chapter of the same book we are told that that the disciples of Ephesus, after they were baptized in the name of Jesus, were confirmed by St. Paul, who laid his hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

Thus you see that this rite was not confined to a few, but that all who were baptized became participators in it. The practice of "laying on of hands," was one of the most ancient ceremonies in the world, and seems to be derived from the pious and simple praetice of the patriarchs. Jacob we are told laid his hands upon Ephraim and Manesses, and in the name of God, pronounced a prophet's blessing. Moses, in his ministerial capacity, by the express command of God, laid his hands on Joshua. Our blessed Lord laid his hands upon those that were sick and healed them; and with that benevolence, which was pre-eminently characteristic of his nature, he laid his hands upon little children and blessed them, and in appointing persons for the ministry, the same custom was invariably observed.

The same was the beautiful and impressive practice of the apostles in communicating the Holy Spirit in Confirmation, and so constantly and generally was it observed that St. Paul calls the office "the laying on of hands." (Heb. VI: 2.) In referring to the ancient Fathers of the Church, we have abundant proof that the practice of this holy ceremony was co-extensive with the Christian Church. Tertullian, who flourished only 80 years after St. John has these words; "After baptism succeeds laying on of hands, by prayer calling for and inviting the Holy Spirit." Cyprian, who flourished about 60 years after Tertullian, remarks on the history of the Samaritan converts. "The same is practiced among us, that they who are baptized in the Church are presented to the governors of it, that by their prayers and imposition of hands, they may obtain the Holy Ghost, and be perfected

with the seal of Christ." "And though, saith St. Augustine, the speaking with tongues and working of miracles do not now attend the laying on of hands, as in the days of the Apostles, yet any one may know now whether he has received the Holy Ghost, by the love he bears to his brother, and his desire of the peace and unity of the Church of Christ." And Jerome speaks of it distinctly as recommended by the custom of the whole christian world, and then adds: "Where persons are baptized in the inferior towns by priests and deacons, the Bishop travels out to them, to lay his hands upon them and invoke the Holy Spirit."

In the early age of christianity this rite was frequently attended with miraculous powers, such visible effects being then necessary to demonstrate the truth of the christian religion; but when whole nations embraced the religion of the cross, the occasion ceased and God then worked by ordinary and not extraordinary means. To suppose therefore that this rite was to cease,—that the Holy Spirit was no longer to be invoked when the extraordinary effects ceased, as Mr. N. would have us to believe is too groundless an assertion to obtain weight with any thinking man. If such an argument were once admitted, it would undermine the whole gospel plan of salvation; since it must apply to one part of the Apostles' practice as well as to another. Then preaching, praying for the sick, ordinations must cease, because miraculous manifestations in those instances have ceased; nay, more than this, if such an argument were once admitted, we must necessarily become a nation of unbelievers. St. Mark tells us "These signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Will any one, therefore say, that because these things do not now follow the act of belief, we are forbidden to exercise that grace? Surely these things are too preposterous to influence the most humble believer.

But what has been regarded as the clearest evidence, that this rite was not to be dispensed with when miraculous power ceased, but was to be retained in the Church in all ages, is that passage of St. Paul before alluded to, (Heb. VI: 2,) where the apostles couples the laying on of hands, which follows baptism with repentance and faith, and regards them as fundamentals; that is; things in which all are interested, and which should be observed by all. The laying on of hands in ordinations, or in blessing, or in healing the sick, was confined to a few; whereas here, all who built upon the true foundation, all who did not leave the "principles of the doctrine of Christ," were expected to be participators; which exactly accords with the record in the 8th and 19th of Acts, where all who enjoyed the sacrament of baptism enjoyed also the subsequent rite of Confirmation, by the "imposition of hands." Thus you see that repentance, faith, baptisms, laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, are regarded by the apostle as "the foundation," the principles of the doctrine of Christ; that this laying on of hands is joined with and follows after baptism; what right have we to put assunder what St. Paul, writing under the inspiration of God, hath joined together.

That the laying on of hands in this passage does not refer to ordination, but to the confirming the baptized, we have the testimony of writers of all ages, and so fully convinced was Calvin on this point, that he conceived that single text abundantly sufficient to prove confirmation to be of apostolic institution; and indeed to think otherwise, would be charging the apostle with the heinous sin of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

But perhaps, some may say, this rite so much spoken of, is only a remnant of Popery, the invention of wicked priests and designing prelates. Such is not the case. We have the consent of the whole christian world to the authority of this rite up to the period of the Reformation; and at this period, it was preserved in every protestant Church, throughout the world, that retained the Episcopal office. The Lutheran Churches too, (see the confession—Saxonica de confirm.) retained confirmation as of apostolic origin.

Luther says, "we hold confirmation to be a certain ecclesiastic ordinance, resembling the other ceremonies of consecrating water and other things; (in the Mosaic dispensation.) For if every other creature is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, why should we not much rather sanctify mankind by the same."—(Luther on the captivity of Babylon,—Ed., Jhen, A. D. 1557, Tom. 2p 293.) Thus while Luther denied it to be a sacrament, he preserved the use of it as an apostolic rite of great utility. Calvin, in his commentary on the VI. Heb: 2 verse, speaks as follows: "The apostle here joins the imposition or the laying on of hands with baptism, because, as there were two orders of catechumens, therefore the ceremony was two fold. For those who were without, were not admitted to baptism until they had delivered their confession of faith. In these, therefore, catechising went before baptism. But the children of believers, since they were adopted from the womb, and belonged to the body of the Church by the right of promise, were baptized while infants; and when the season of infancy passed away, and they had been instructed in the faith, they also offered themselves to be catechised; which catechising, in their case,

was subsequent to baptism. But then another rite was applied to them, namely, the laying on of hands. This one passage, continues Calvin, abundantly proves that *the origin of this ceremony flowed from the apostles*, although it was afterwards turned into superstition, as the world almost always degenerates from the best institutions into corruptions." (Heb. VI. Ed. Hal. A. D. 1831, vol 2, p 428.) This, be it remembered, was written towards the close of his life, when his mind was matured and his knowledge enlarged, and from this sentiment he never after varied. Dr. Owen a celebrated nonconformist gives to this text a like interpretation with Calvin.

Beza together with many more of the foreign Reformers acknowledged its utility and apostolic origin, and regretted that it should be discontinued in any Church. The excellent Mathew Henry, a Presbyterian, also commenting upon Heb. VI. 2., says that it means "laying on of hands on persons passing solemnly from the initiated state of baptism to the confirmed state, by returning the answer of a good conscience towards God and sitting down at the Lord's Table. This passing from incomplete to complete Church membership, he says, was performed by the laying on of hands, which the extraordinary conveyance of the gift of the Holy Ghost continued."

With regard to the opinions of John Wesley, I need say nothing, as he 'lived and died a member of the Church of England;' I shall therefore pass on to Dr. Adam Clarke, who was himself confirmed after he became a Wesleyan preacher.

In the account of his life, published by the Methodist Book Concern at New York, in 1833, we find the following statement of this transaction. "It was at this time that the Bishop of Bristol held a *Confirmation* in the Collegiate Church. I had never been confirmed, and as I had a high respect for all the rites and ceremonies of the Church, I wished to embrace this opportunity to get the blessing of that amiable and apostolic looking prelate, Dr. Lewis Bagot. I asked permission; several of the preacher's sons went with me, and I felt much satisfaction in this ordinance; to me it was very solemn, and the whole was well conducted. Mrs. S. who was a presbyterian, pitied my being so 'long held in the oldness of the letter.' I have lived *nearly forty years* since, and upon *this point my sentiments are not changed.*" Vol. I, p. 94

In a letter to Mrs. Wilkinson from Dr. Clarke, given in the same work, vol. 3: p. 123, we find the following language. "Again, the rite itself (Confirmation) is useful to call these things (our christian obligations) to remembrance, and who knows how much grace may be received during the performance of the ceremony, and especially by having a holy man's hands laid on your head, and the blessing and protection of God solemnly invoked in your behalf? Tell these things to your dear daughters and sons,—tell them another thing of which few would think, namely, that not having had the opportunity of being confirmed when I had arrived at the age in which I had an ecclesiastic right to receive it, I was determined not to be without it, and therefore went and received confirmation, even since I became a Methodist preacher." "You see now, my good Sister, both from my teaching and from my practice, what I think of the rite of confirmation."

In proof. That this rite was confined to the highest order of the Ministers of the Church, Dr. Clarke, commenting upon Acts, VIII, says; "It seems evident from this case, that even the most holy deacons, though full of the Holy Ghost themselves, could not confer the heavenly gift on others."

The Confession of faith of the Baptists of England, adopted by the Baptist Association of the United States, contains the following passage. "We believe that 'laying on of hands' with prayer upon baptized believers as such, is an *ordinance of Christ*, and ought to be submitted unto by all such persons as are permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper. And that the end of this ordinance is not for the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, but for a further reception of the Holy Spirit of promise, or for the addition of the graces of the Spirit and the influences thereof, to *confirm*, strengthen and comfort them in Christ Jesus. Ed. 1827, p. 69.

To these fair and honest testimonies to the value and importance of Confirmation from non-episcopalians, I shall only add, at present, the following words of an eminent prelate of the present day, Bishop McIlvaine. "To the members of our communion who are surrounded by loquacious adversaries, and sometimes staggered in the faith, 'by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive,' we say, 'hold fast to this form of sound words.' When 'the enemy cometh in like a flood,' and vexes you with questions respecting the ground on which your attachment to the rite of confirmation is based, lift up your standard and say,—on the ground of apostolic practice, uninterrupted, and for fifteen hundred years undisputed; and the present consentaneous testimony of the highest councils of four great divisions of Christendom—Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians."

With regard to the expressions of Calvin, adduced by Mr. Nankeville,—you will be surprised when I tell you that they have not the most remote reference to the Church of England. Calvin is combatting the Romish error of making confirmation a sacrament and

from my heart, I can subscribe every expression of that eminent man on this point. "O, the iniquity of this proceeding!" To apply terms of reproach and contumely to the Church of England, which the author applied to the Church of Rome;—to make Calvin contradict himself for the purpose of gratifying the defamers spleen against that Church in which he was cradled and brought up! Can anything be more humiliating than the conduct of Mr. N. in endeavoring to show that Calvin exposed "the absurdity and impiety of this rite? a rite of which he has spoken so highly? Can anything be more humiliating than this? Yes, dear brethren, I have a heavier tale of sorrow to narrate. In the instance just mentioned he falsifies a good man who in some points differed from us; but in what I am now to notice, he aims his poisoned arrow against a bishop of our Church and not only misrepresents and falsifies him, but uses *his own words* as though they were the Bishop's.

He makes Bishop Burnett to say that "There is no express institution for confirmation, either by Christ or his apostles: no rule given to practice it. The whole is merely a matter of human arrangement." In the first place, the Bishop tells us he is about to examine the other pretended sacraments "of the Romish Church." 2. Mr. N. takes his extract from the middle of a sentence, after a comma, and then after quoting one line and a half, he finishes the extract in his own words. Had he given even one *word* before the extract or one line after it, his imposture could not have been hidden, and yet this man, with unblushing front, tells us, that he was "called to the office and work of the ministry by God, and the Church." The Methodist Society I presume. "Lord what is man."

To give all that Bishop Burnett says upon confirmation, as used in our Church would be to repeat all I have said upon the subject; I shall therefore confine myself to his concluding remarks. "It is highly reasonable that they, who gave no actual consent of their own, should come and by their own express act, make the stipulations of baptism. It may give greater impressions of awe and respect, when this is restrained to the highest order in the Church. Upon the sincere vows and earnest prayers of persons thus confirmed, we have reason to believe that a proportioned degree of God's grace and Spirit will be poured out upon them. And in all this we are much confirmed, when we see such warrants for it in Scripture. A thing so good in itself, that has at least a probable authority for it, and was certainly a practice of the first ages, is upon very just grounds continued in our Church. Would to God it were as seriously gone about, as it is lawfully established."—(Burnett, Art. XXV: p. 320.) So much for Bishop Burnett, and that Mr. N. was aware of the falsehood which he uttered or very careless in his research is evident from the fact, that there are but *eight* words between his extract and that which I have just read.

We proceed to consider the case of the Hampton Court Conference. It appears that King James was not satisfied with confirmation; "that name seeming to imply that baptism is of no validity without it; he abhored this opinion and the abuse which made it a sacrament," Such was his objection and upon the matter being explained to him by the Bishops, we are told they "fully satisfied the King," and so thoroughly was he convinced on this point that he resisted Dr. Reynolds a Presbyterian divine, pronouncing his objection a mere cavil and declaring that it was not his intention to take from them; the Bishops, what they had so long enjoyed. "I approve" said he, "the calling and use of Bishops in the Church; and it is my aphorism, no Bishop, no King." Thus you see the dishonesty of this extract.

Another infamous libel upon the truth is that which he professes to have taken from the Prayer Book. He says "there is a solemn declaration made by the bishop, in administering the rite of confirmation 'that the Almighty and Everlasting God has given forgiveness of all their sins'—all their actual, personal sins." From what source, I would ask, did Mr. N. get his information? Certainly not from the Prayer Book; it speaks a different language. There is no "*solemn declaration* made there by the Bishop," or any one else. The *Prayer* used in the administration of the rite, when the bishop lays his hand upon the head of the person to be confirmed, is as follows; "Defend, O Lord, this thy servant with thy heavenly grace, that he may continue thine forever; and daily increase in thy holy Spirit more and more, until he come to thy everlasting Kingdom. Amen." Is there a syllable of forgiveness of sins here, either *actual or personal?* That which Mr. N. styles "a solemn declaration," is a prayer for those who are about to be confirmed and precedes the administration of the rite and refers to baptism, as would be seen by the most ordinary observer had a correct extract been given. That you may judge for yourselves, I will give the words of the Prayer Book. "Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water, and the Holy Ghost and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech thee," &c. Here you see there is no allusion whatever to confirmation, but a plain and simple reference to baptism, by which sacrament we believe original sin to be done away, though its effects remain, bringing us under the bondage of sin and Satan. Such are the views of the Church of England—such are the views of John Wesley, and such I apprehend are the views of Mr.

Nankeville; but that gentleman, reckless of consequences, hesitates not to falsify himself, if, in doing so he can inflict a wound upon the Church of his fathers. Hear his own words; "Do not infants belong to Christ as partakers of the atonement? Has he not died for them, and risen again, delivering them from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for them? Are not infants as well as believers in a justified state, according to Paul? Rom. V.: 18, 19. Here it may be observed, that the infant and the believer stand in the same relation to Christ as partakers of his death. They are both justified, as having no *actual* sin lying against them."* "This is enough to make any pious man tremble." He first mis-calls, then mis-quotes, then mis-applies, then misrepresents, and in conclusion brands *himself* with falsehood. He could not be ignorant that the expression in the Prayer Book applied to baptism. No; as a proof of this, he took the first and fifth line of the sentence, leaving out the intermediate lines which would have detected the fraud. Therefore, I repeat he brands himself with falsehood, by charging the Church with forgiving in baptism "actual sins," when it does no such thing.

But he himself declares "that infants and believers stand in the same relation to Christ as partakers of his death—that they are both justified, as having no *actual* sin lying against them." O, the daring presumption of that man! Can the Methodists indeed sanction such Pelagian heresy?

Next comes his grand and sweeping conclusion. "How could confirmation, have an existence, when Sponsors or Godfathers, and Godmothers was a term unknown to the ancients: but familiar in later times—hence it is *purely human*. That Sponsors were first appointed by Hyginus a Roman Bishop, about the year 154, and the office was not in full operation until the 4th or 5th century." This I shall answer by a short extract from Mr. Wesley's "Serious Thoughts concerning Godfathers and Godmothers, a tract worthy of the notice of every Churchman and Methodist. "These (Godfathers and Godmothers) have been retained in the Christian Church from the *earliest times*, as the reason for them was the same in all ages."

"Who shall decide when doctors disagree."

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

We are told that "They (the Clergy,) were opposed to the Reformation; and it was not till they found all resistance to Henry's power, to be in vain, that they submitted to his pleasure and were modelled according to his will; which dictated the plan of the Church of England. Hence, the Church of England dates its origin, from the time of the Reformation."

Nothing but the most profound ignorance of history could have led Mr. N. to write thus. Had such an expression fallen from a Romanist, I should not have been surprised; their aim being to class the Church of England with the body of Dissenters from it. Coming from such a quarter I should have felt myself called upon to meet it with *argument;* but coming as it does from a professed follower of Wesley, I can only meet it with a *smile.*— However, for his information, I will give a few facts of history which may lead him not to be guilty of a similar error in future.

Eusebius asserts that some of the apostles passed over into Britain and he, together with Jerome, fix the period of the establishment of Christianity in that Island in the 2nd year of Nero, in the year 56, about 26 years after the crucifixion. The modern writers, Scaliger, Cave, Stillingfleet and others coincide with this chronology, but Pearson and Hale differ from this computation, in assigning it to the year 61 or 62: but all these, together with Usher, place it as early as 57 years from the Saviour's death, between the 1st and 2d imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome. Tertullian who lived in the 2nd century tells us; "All the extremities of Spain and the different nations of Gaul and parts of Britain, inaccessible to the Romans, but (were) subject to Christ." Theodoret attributes the foundation of the British Church to St. Paul, who is thought to have visited that Island, the extremity of the then known world, from Gaul or Spain. Origen, who lived in the next age, speaks of Britain consenting to the worship of the true God. In addition to this we have it recognised by all the Church as a portion of the Christian Community in the 2nd century. In the year 314 the Bishops of York, London and Lincoln, sat as representatives of

* Mr. N's. Tract against the Baptists.

the Anglican Church at the council of Arles, convened by the Emperor Constantine. At the council of Sardica, A. D. 347 and at Ariminium A. D. 359, the Bishops of the Anglican Church sat and voted, and there were seven British Bishops and a British Archbishop when Augustine landed in England, who was indebted for his first night's lodging to the Christian Bishop Lithardus, who accompanied Queen Bertha, wife of Ethelbert, from France."

Now it was not until the year 596 that Augustine with his Monks landed in England; previous to which time we have not the slightest trace of the Pope of Rome having exercised any authority in England. From that time the Church of England was gradually brought to groan under the usurpation of a foreign power until the period of the Reformation when she threw off her corruptions and reclaimed her former independence, as a branch of the holy Catholic Church of Christ, of which she has ever been a part. Thus you will perceive we did not *form* a new Church, but we *re-formed* the old;—we turned from Rome *as it is*, to Rome as it was, when "her faith was spoken of throughout the world." "The *errors* of the Church of England were not the Church herself; and in quitting them she did not quit herself, any more than a man *changes* his skin when he *cleanses* it, or loses his body when he recovers from a disease. The English Church after the Reformation was as much the English Church, as Naaman was Naaman after he had washed in the river Jordan; indeed as "his flesh then came again," so was she *restored* to her *healthful* self at the Reformation." And this, be it remembered was not the act of a few; no, it was under God the act of her Bishops and Clergy in full convocation, who freely repudiated Romanism; transferring at the same time the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and temporal supremacy from the Pope: the one to the Bishops and the other to the Sovereign of the Kingdom, who has been from that time acknowledged as temporal "head of the Church" in all matters ecclesiastical and civil, *but not spiritual*. This Reformation adopted by the Bishops and Clergy was submitted to both Houses of the Legislature and solemnly ratified and confirmed by Act of Parliament, and the Church thus purified and reformed was accepted by the State and people, and became as she had been before, "the pillar and ground of the truth." Thus was the Church of England reformed by her own act, the act of her Bishops and Clergy, and this reformation was sanctioned in the different stages of its progress by Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth. Her Protestanism is new, for the errors against which she protests are new, but her faith is "the faith once delivered to the saints."

And here admitting for argument sake, that Henry VIII was the leading agent in bringing about the Reformation; how does that affect the question; what do our adversaries gain by that? "The workman is not the work. The Temple of Solomon was constructed with cedars of Lebanon, hewn by workmen of *heathen* Tyre. Jehu did not please God; but his Reformation did. Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus were idolatrous; but their Edicts for God's service were religious. The Temple in which our Lord was presented and in which he preached and worshipped had been repaired and restored by the impious and cruel Herod, who sought our Lord's life." The character and conduct of those engaged in the Reformation was not the Reformation itself. That was the work of God, whose goodness, in raising up instruments to perform his sovereign pleasure, we shall have reason to bless in this world and in the world to come.

What then becomes of the assertion that "the Church of England dates its origin from the time of the Reformation,—that the clergy were opposed to the Reformation?—that they submitted to Henry's pleasure only when they found all resistance vain?" What compulsion was used by the mild and youthful Edward, who blessed be God, took Cranmer for his adviser and the Bible for his guide? Did he, at the age of *nine years*, force the Bishop and Clergy of the Church of England 'to submit to his pleasure, to be modelled according to his will?' In the 'Western Insurrection' when the people of Devonshire and Cornwall clamoured for the return of popery, did the Bishops of the Church of England lend their aid to promote their wishes? Were they opposed to the Reformation in the reign of bloody Mary, when for four long years the fires of Smithfield were fed from the Bishops and Clergy—when the noblest of England's Church quenched with their blood the flames of persecution? Were they opposed to the Reformation when in the midst of the burning flames, they repudiated the errors of Romanism and the domination of Rome? No, they preferred death in its most aggravated form to the ghostly control of papal tyranny;—to the surrender of the precious truth known and taught in England before Rome had spread her sable mantle over her fair inheritance. Were I disposed to harrow up your feelings and tell you of that noble army of Martyrs, the Bishops and Clergy of our Church; though your hearts were as hard as the nether millstone—though your eyes were 'not to weeping given,' you could not withhold the tear of pity—you could not refuse a passing tribute. Long had the beauty of our Church been marred—long had her vineyard been trodden down by strangers—long had her pleasant places been laid waste—long had she groaned beneath the fury of the oppressor; until God in his mercy had pity upon her and

armed her children for her rescue; and were it not for the very clergy, whom we now hear depreciated, we would at this day be counting our beads and worshipping a consecrated wafer.

And here I would ask, if the Church of England dates its orign from the the time of the Reformation, how is "Methodism founded on the Rock of Ages?" Is the *child* older than its *mother*—is the *branch* more ancient than the *stem* that bore it? This is too ridiculous to be treated with seriousness. Nevertheless, I cannot dismiss this subject without expressing a fear that the faith of Mr. Nankeville is not altogether orthodox. It looks not a little suspicious to see him disparage the reformation and slander the agents whom God raised up to effect it.

"Coming events cast their shadows before."

CHAPTER III.

THE SUPPOSED ORDINATION OF DR. COKE.

As it was lately asserted to me that the Methodists derive their ministry from the States, I shall begin by enquiring into the validity of Wesley's ordinations. For on this point rests the validity of the Methodist Ministry. If Wesley had authority to ordain Dr. Coke a *Bishop*, then I grant the Methodists have a lawful Ministry and lawful Sacraments; but if Wesley had no such authority to ordain him, then they have neither a *lawful* Ministry nor *lawful* Sacraments: and as there cannot be a Christian Church without a lawful Ministry and lawful Sacraments, it will in that case necessarily follow that what is called the "Methodist Church" is not, as such, a part of the Church of Christ.

Now, lest any one may suppose that full justice is not given to the Methodists in this matter, I shall quote the first Section of their Book of Discipline, "published by E. Ryerson and F. Metcalf," at York, now Toronto, in the year 1829. It reads as follows:*

"OF THE ORIGIN OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH."

"The preachers and members of our society in general, being convinced that there was "a great deficiency of vital religion in the Church of England in America, and being in "many places destitute of the Christian sacraments, as several of the clergy had forsaken "their churches, requested the late Rev. John Wesley to take such measures, in his wisdom "and prudence, as would afford them suitable relief in their distress.

"In consequence of this, our venerable friend, who, under God, had been the Father of "the great revival of religion now extending over the earth, by the means of the Metho-"dists, determined to ordain Ministers for America; and for this purpose, in the year 1784, "sent over three regularly ordained clergy; but preferring the Episcopal mode of Church "government to any other, he solemnly set apart, by the imposition of his hands, and "prayer, one of them, viz: *Thomas Coke*, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College, in "the University of Oxford, and a Presbyter of the Church of England, for the Episcopal "office; and having delivered to him letters of Episcopal orders, commissioned and direct-"ed him to set apart *Francis Asbury* [illegible] for the same Episcopal office; he, the said "*Francis Asbury*, being first ordained Deacon and † Presbyter. In consequence of which, "the said *Francis Asbury*, was solemnly set apart for the same Episcopal office by prayer "and the imposition of the hands of the said *Thomas Coke*, other regularly ordained Minis-"ters assisting in the sacred ceremony. At which time the General Conference, held at "Baltimore, did unanimously receive the said *Thomas Coke* and *Francis Asbury* as their "Bishops, being fully satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal ordination."

It is here stated that Mr. Wesley solemnly set apart Dr. Coke to be a Bishop—that he delivered unto him letters of Episcopal orders in which he commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury to be a Bishop also; the said Francis Asbury being first ordained Deacon and Presbyter—that the General Conference, held at Baltimore, *unanimously at that time* received the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their Bishops.

You will be surprised when I tell you that these assertions are untrue from beginning to end. In the first place—

* I am indebted to "a Letter to a Methodist" for this and the two following chapters, and have used his language with some additions of my own, for the sake of classifying the subject.

† Presbyter, Priest and Elder, being one and the same, to avoid confusion, I shall use the word Presbyter throughout.

1. Dr. Coke was not ordained to the Episcopal office, in other words, was not made Bishop.

2. No such letters of Episcopal orders were ever issued by John Wesley, and consequently no such commission was given to Dr. Coke to ordain Asbury a Bishop.

3. The General Conference, held at Baltimore, did not *at that time* unanimously receive Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their Bishops.

Now as the validity of the Methodist Ministry is made, by the Methodists themselves, to depend upon the validity of Dr. Coke's ordination we shall treat of it first.

Where did Wesley obtain *authority* to ordain Dr. Coke? It certainly was not *born* with him; for authority to ordain a minister of Christ is born with no man. He could not have obtained it from any temporal power; for all the Kings and Governors of the earth combined could not ordain a minister of Christ, nor confer the authority to ordain one.

Was this authority conferred on Wesley at his *ordination?* The most ignorant man could not say so; since the authority to ordain in the Church of England, of which Wesley lived and died a member, is confined exclusively to the order of Bishops, and Wesley was not consecrated a Bishop, but only ordained a Presbyter. As no such authority was then conferred on Wesley, he did not obtain it when he was ordained.

Yes, but says the Methodist, what more authority did Wesley want than that which he had? Was he not a Presbyter of the Church of England, and are not Bishops and Presbyters one and the same order of Ministers; therefore Wesley being a Presbyter was also a Bishop and consequently had authority to ordain?

Let us examine this.

A Presbyter and a Bishop says the Methodist is one and the same order of Ministers and therefore Wesley was a Bishop and as such had a right to ordain.

If Wesley were a *Bishop* because he was a *Presbyter*, then Dr. Coke must also have been a Bishop, since *he* was a *Presbyter* when Wesley "laid his hands upon him." And if Dr. Coke was already a Bishop, what did Wesley make by ordaining him? Not a Bishop, surely; for he was one already, if Presbyters and Bishops be the *same order!* What then? He must have made him an officer higher than a Bishop—an officer unknown to the Church of God! Besides if Dr. Coke, being a Presbyter, was, *therefore*, a Bishop, he had the same right to ordain Wesley, as Wesley had to ordain him?

Thus you see at a glance the utter absurdity and falsity of the assertion contained in the Book of Discipline; That Coke was ordained a Bishop by Wesley. Let Wesley speak for himself.

When he sent out Dr. Coke, he gave him the following instrument in writing, which "The Book of Discipline," before quoted, call's his "Letters of Episcopal orders."

"To all to whom these presents shall come, John Wesley, late Fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, *Presbyter* of the Church of England, sendeth greeting:

"Whereas, many of the people in the Southern Provinces of North America, who desire to continue under my care, *and still adhere to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England*, are greatly distressed for want of ministers to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, *according to the usage of the same Church*, and whereas there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers,*

"Know all men, that I, John Wesley, think myself to be providentially called at this time to set apart some persons for the work of the ministry in America. And therefore, under the protection of Almighty God, and with a single eye to his glory, I have this day set apart a *Superintendent*, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, a Presbyter of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work. And I do hereby *recommend* him to all whom it may concern, as a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ. In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand, seven hundred and eighty four.†

JOHN WESLEY."

Such is what is now pawned upon the credulous and unthinking as the letters of Episcopal orders, upon which so much stress is laid and upon which the whole fabric of Methodism depends.

What are we to think then of the bold assertion, contained in the Book of Discipline, that Wesley set apart Coke for the Episcopal office? It is no where to be found in Wesley's commission, but is a fabrication of later times.

*In quoting this letter, Mr. Nankeville says:—"The following is a *faithful copy carefully transcribed* from the original, in Mr. Wesley's own hand writing;" and yet he leaves out the second clause altogether, beginning at "Wh reas," and ending with "Ministers." Is not this humiliating? Is not this fearful? He leaves out that which speaks of adherence to the Church of England and calls it "*a faithful copy carefully transcribed* from the original." Will this *faithful* copier and *careful* transcriber favor us with a reading of the Autograph?

†Reprinted from a tract written by Dr. George Peck, a Methodist Preacher.

Now in all probability, you are under the impression that this imposition of hands was done in a Church, or at least in a meeting house and openly before the people. No such thing; the whole business was "done in a corner,"—in Wesley's *bed chamber* at Bristol.—However it soon got noised abroad that Wesley had made a Bishop and so ludicrous and absurd did it appear to the Rev. Charles Wesley, who was not in the secret, that on hearing of it, he wrote the following lines, to the great mortification of his brother:

"So easily are Bishops made,
By man's or woman's whim;
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,—
But who laid hands on him ?"

And in writing to the Rev. Dr. Chandler, April 27th, 1785, he says, "I can scarcely yet believe, that in his eighty second year, my brother, my old, intimate, friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained Elders, consecrated a Bishop, and sent him to ordain the lay preachers in America. I was then in Bristol at his elbow; yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. *How was he surprised into so rash an action?* I have lived on earth a little too long, who have lived to see this evil day; but I shall very soon be taken from it. What will become of these poor sheep in the wilderness, the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England, which their preachers and they no more intended than the Methodists? Had they had patience a little longer they would have seen a real primitive Bishop (Bishop Seabury) in America, *duly consecrated by three Scotch Bishops*, who had their consecration from the English Bishops, and are acknowledged by them the same as themselves. There is, therefore, not the least difference between the members of Bishop Seabury's Church, and the members of the Church of England.

"You know I had the happiness to converse with that truly apostolic man, who is esteemed by all who know him as much as by you and me. He told me that he looked upon the Methodists in America as sound members of the Church, and was ready to ordain any of their preachers, whom he should find duly qualified. *His ordination would be indeed genuine, valid and Episcopal.* But what are you poor Methodists now? *only a new sect of Presbyterians*, and after my poor brother's death, which is now so very near, what will be their end? They will lose all their influence and importance; they will turn aside to vain janglings; they will settle again upon their lees, and like other sects of dissenters, come to nothing."

Hitherto I have argued this question on the ground taken by the Methodists, that Wesley ordained Dr. Coke a *Bishop;* by a Bishop meaning the first and highest office of the Church of God, and that Wesley himself was such a Bishop. But this we deny, because,

1st. Wesley in the above so called letters of orders, styles himself a Presbyter of the Church of England. 2ndly. In that document he does not say a word about having ordained Dr. Coke to be a Bishop, but merely that he "set him apart as a Superintendent." Now what did Wesley mean by setting him apart as a Superintendent?

In a letter dated Bristol, Sept. 10, 1784, (only eight days after he laid his hands on Coke) addressed (not to Bishop Coke, but) to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and our Brethren in North America, is the following paragraph, which explains the whole transaction.

"I have *appointed* Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint Superintendents over our Brethren in North America."

Let us examine his language narrowly.

1. Wesley does not say he ordained Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, but simply that he "appointed" them. But by using the word appointed did Wesley mean that he ordained them? Certainly not; because the same word (appointed) is used concerning them both, and Wesley did NOT ordain Asbury, for Asbury was at that time in America, four thousand miles distant, and had been there for several years previously. Nevertheless, Wesley appointed him a Superintendent as well as Coke, and as ordination was not necessary to constitute Asbury a Superintendent, neither was it necessary to constitute Dr. Coke one; and it is evident that as Asbury was not ordained, Coke could not have been, (as the same word "appointed" is used concerning them both) and it is also evident that Wesley did not mean to say he had ordained them, when he said he 'appointed' them, for Asbury was only a *layman* at this time, when Dr. Coke came to America and was afterwards ordained by Dr. Coke, deacon, elder or Presbyter and Superintendent, or, as he afterwards called himself Bishop in three successive days, the 25th, 26th and 27th of December 1784. Indeed the idea of *ordaining* a Superintendent of a merely human society, for at that time the "Methodist Church" was not known, is a thing ut terly unknown to the Scriptures and the Church of God. It is precisely the same thing as if a Presbyter now were to ordain a Superintendent for the Sunday School Union or a Bible Society. Wesley was too sound a divine to adopt any such absurd notion. He was himself the Superintendent of the Methodists in England, but had never been ordained to that office; and if Wesley could be a Superintendent without ordination, the same could be done by Coke or Asbury without

ordination. "Ordination is not to be confounded with the *designating* or *setting apart* of a person for the work of the ministry; for in strictness any one may do this for himself, or it may be done for him by his parents, guardians, &c., and involves nothing but what a *layman* may perform; whereas ordination is the actual *communication of authority* from a *legitimate* source, to execute those functions which appertain to the several orders of the ministry."

Indeed, brethren, there is not the slightest particle of evidence to prove that Wesley ever ordained Dr. Coke, much less, that he made him a Bishop. Coke was placed on precisely the same footing with Asbury, who was a *layman*. Wesley appointed them both Superintendents of the Methodist Society in North America: and the only difference between them is, that in appointing Coke he did it in a more formal manner, by placing his hands on his head and praying over him.

I shall now show what Dr. Coke himself thought of his title of Bishop which he had the arrogance to assume; and by giving you a few extracts from his letters to Bishops White and Seabury to ordain him and Asbury Bishops, the question will, I trust for the present be set at rest, and every honest man be convinced that the thing which I undertook to prove, namely, that Dr. Coke was not ordained Bishop by Wesley, is proved to a demonstration.

RICHMOND, April 24th, 1791.

DR. COKE TO BISHOP WHITE.

Right Rev. Sir:—Permit me to intrude a little on your time in a matter of great importance. You, I belive, are conscious that I was brought up in the Church of England, and have been ordained a Presbyter of that Church. For many years I was prejudiced even I think to bigotry, in favour of it, but through a variety of causes or incidents, to mention which would be tedious and useless, my mind was exceedingly biased on the other side of the question. In consequence of this I am not sure but I went farther in the separation of our Church in America, than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend. He did indeed solemnly invest me as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal authority, but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place. He, being pressed by our friends on this side of the water for ministers to administer the sacraments to them, (there being very few Clergy of the Church of England then in the States,) went farther I am sure, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed. And this I am certain of—that he is now sorry for the separation."

He then goes on to say; "What can be done for a re-union, which I much wish for; and to accomplish which, Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost? There are many hindrances in the way. Can they be removed? Our ordained ministers will not, ought not to give up their right of administering the sacraments. I don't think that the generality of them, perhaps none of them, will refuse to submit to a re-ordination, if other hindrances were removed out of the way." He then goes on to show the difficulties which are likely to ensue from the preachers being unacquainted with the learned languages and which almost make him "tremble."

"In Europe," he says "where some steps had been taken, tending to a separation, all is at an end. Mr. Wesley is a determined enemy of it, and I have lately borne an open and successful testimony against it." He then desires a private interview with the Bishop in Philadelphia, and impresses upon him the utmost secrecy until, he says, "the minds of you, your brother Bishops and Mr. Wesley, be circumstantially known." He then asks that if the Bishop has no thoughts of improving this proposal, he will burn his letter and take no more notice of it.*

Now, Brethren, were he a Bishop, even in his own estimation would he propose that those, who had been ordained by him, should be re-ordained by one who, he knew, had authority to do so: whose *ordination would be indeed genuine, valid and Episcopal?* or would he acknowledge the ordination by himself was invalid, although he was a Presbyter of the Church of England? The thing speaks for itself.

Let us now see what he says in his letter to Bishop Seabury:

PHILADELPHIA, May 14, 1791.

DR. COKE TO BISHOP SEABURY.

Right Rev. Sir:—From your well known character, I am going to open my mind to you on a subject of very great importance. Being educated a member of the Church of England from my earliest infancy, being ordained of that Church and having taken two degrees in arts and two degrees in civil law in the University of Oxford, which is entirely under the patronage of the Church of England, I was almost a bigot in its favor when I first joined that great and good man, Mr. John Wesley, which is fourteen years ago. For five or six years after my union with Mr. Wesley, I remained fixed in my attachment to the

* This letter is reprinted from Bishop White's Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, first edition pages 424 to 429.

Church of England; but afterwards for many reasons, which it would be tedious and useless to mention, I changed my sentiments, and promoted a separation from it, as far as my influence reached. Within these two years I am come back again; my love for the Church of England has returned. I think I am attached to it on a ground much more rational and consequently much less likely to be shaken than formerly. I have many a time run into error, but to be ashamed of confessing my error, when convinced of it, has never been one of my defects. Therefore, when *I was fully convinced of my error*, and in the steps I took to bring about a separation from the Church of England in Europe, I delivered, before a congregation of about 3000 people, in our largest chapel in Dublin, on a Sunday evening, after preaching, an exhortation, which in fact, amounted to a recantation of my error. Some time afterward, I repeated the same in our largest chapel in London, and in several other parts of England and Ireland; and I have reason to believe that my proceedings in this respect have given a death blow to all the hopes of a separation which may exist in the minds of any in those kingdoms."

From this he goes on to state the extent of their missions and asks; "How great, then, would be the strength of *our* Church (will you give me leave to call it so? I mean the Protestant Episcopal) if the two sticks were made one." He then goes on to say, what concessions it would be necessary to make and gives a full account of their preachers and so on; after which he says; "Now a re-union taking place, our ministers, both elders and deacons, would expect to have, and ought to have, the same authority they have at present, of administering the ordinances according to the respective powers already invested in them for this purpose. I well know that they must submit to a re-ordination, which I believe might be easily brought about, if every other hindrance was removed out of the way. He then shows how those hindrances may be removed and defends himself against the charge of being suspected of pressing after wordly honor, for he says "As it is likely I shall be elected President of the European Methodists, and shall not, I believe, receive greater marks of respect from the Methodists in these States, *supposing I ever be a Bishop* of the Protestant Episcopal Church, than they are at present so kind as to show me."

He then says "Mr. Asbury, our resident Superintendent, is a great and good man. He possesses, and justly, the esteem of most of the preachers, and most of the people. Now if the general convention of the Clergy *consented that he should be consecrated a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, on the supposition of a reunion, a very capital hindrance would be removed out of the way."

"Again, I love the Methodists in America, and could not think of leaving them entirely, whatever might happen to me in Europe. The preachers and people also love me. Many have a peculiar regard for me. But I could not *with propriety*, visit the American Methodists, possessing in our Church on this side of the water an office inferior to that of Mr. Asbury. But if the two houses of the convention of the clergy would consent to your consecration of Mr. Asbury and me as Bishops of the Methodist Society in the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States (or by any other title, if that be not proper) on the supposition of the reunion of the two churches, under proper mutual stipulations; and engage that the Methodist Society shall have a regular supply, on the death of their Bishops, and so, *ad perpetuum*, the grand difficulty in respect to the preachers would be removed."*

Now take this in connexion with Dr. Coke's letter to Lord Liverpool to whom he afterwards applied to have himself consecrated as a Bishop for India; saying that "if the Prince Regent and the Government should think proper to appoint him their Bishop in India, he would most cheerfully and gratefully accept the offer, and return most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the established Church, and submit to all such restrictions, in the fulfillment of his office, as the Government and the bench of Bishops at home should think necessary."

In summing up the evidence of these letters, written six years and more after Dr. Coke's, so called ordination, it will appear to any honest man,

1. That Dr. Coke does not for a moment claim to be a Bishop.

2. His letter to Bishop White shows that he exceeded the authority given to him by Mr. Wesley, and that Mr. Wesley disapproved of his proceedings.

3. In his letter to Bishop Seabury he solicits to be made "a Bishop of the Methodist Society." Thereby ackhowledging, that Wesley, when he appointed him a Superintendent, did not ordain him a Bishop of that Society.

4. In his letter to Bishop Seabury he asks him to ordain Mr. Asbury a Bishop of the Methodist Society, thereby acknowledging that his ordination of Asbury to be a Bishop, was only a mock ordination.

5. In his letter to Bishop Seabury, asking for the admission of the Methodist preachers into the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr. Coke says, that "he knows they must submit to

* The original of this letter is in the possession of Dr. Seabury, Editor of the Churchman, New York.

a reordination;" of course the ordination they received from him was good for nothing; otherwise there would have been no necessity for their being ordained over again.

6. These letters prove that Dr. Coke knew and believed that Bishops alone possessed authority to ordain—that no such authority was possessed by Presbyters (otherwise his own ordinations would have been valid, for he was a Presbyter) and consequently that he knew and believed that Presbyters and Bishops were not the same order.

7. These letters show conclusively what was Dr. Coke's opinion of Wesleys ordinations (as they are called) that is, that they possessed no validity whatever, and therefore that when Wesley *appointed* him a Superintendent of the Methodist Society, he did not ordain him a Bishop.

8. That had Dr. Coke not been fully convinced of the invalidity of Wesley's ordinations he never would have applied to Lord Liverpool to have himself consecrated a Bishop for India.

9. That he never would have submitted to all such restrictions in the fulfillment of his office, as "the government and *bench of Bishops* should think necessary," did he entertain the conviction that he was a Bishop already.

10. That "Being educated a member of the Church of England from his earliest infancy and being ordained in that Church," he could not be ignorant that *the bench of Bishops* would require him to be re-ordained, (if such a term be applicable) since "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, except he had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."

I shall now proceed to prove that the Methodists themselves do not believe that Presbyters and Bishops are *the same order.*

Because, if Presbyters and Bishops were the *same order*, when a man is ordained a Presbyter or Elder, he would be a Bishop, without any further ordination; but the Methodists require those, whom they are about to elevate to the order of Bishop, to submit to a *third* ordination, and thereby acknowledge, that they do not consider a Presbyter or Elder, to be a Bishop without such ordination, and consequently deny them to be the same order.

The Methodist form for the ordination of Presbyters or Elders you will find in the 116th page of their Book of Discipline, before referred to; and that for the ordination of those they call Bishops may be found in page 128 of the same Book. And as these forms were drawn up by Wesley from the ordination offices in the Prayer Book of the Church of England; it is an additional proof (if such were wanting) that he did not believe Presbyters and Bishops to be the same order; because if he did, why did *he*—why do the Methodists *now* require those they call Presbyters, to submit to a *third* ordination, before they allow them to be called Bishops?

Let those answer this question who can.

To conclude: the question which I undertook to prove was, that Dr. Coke was not ordained Bishop by Wesley, in proof of which I have shown that Wesley had no *authority* to ordain him.

1. That it was not born with him.

2. That he did not attain it from any *temporal* power.

3. That it was not conferred on him at his *ordination* by the Bishops of the Church of England.

4. That he did not ordain Dr. Coke a Bishop, because if Bishop and Presbyter be the *same order*, Dr. Coke was already a Bishop *without Wesley's ordination*—Dr. Coke being a Presbyter of the Church of England.

5. That Wesley did not ordain Dr. Coke a Bishop, but only *appointed* him a Superintendent of the Methodist Society; as is evident from his letter written only *eight* days after.

6. That in *appointing* him a Superintendent, Wesley did not ordain him a Bishop.

7. That Dr. Coke, in applying to Bishop Seabury to ordain Asbury a Bishop, admits that his own ordination of Asbury, to be a Bishop, was a mock ordination, *without any real validity.*

8. That Dr. Coke, by applying to Bishops White and Seabury to admit the Methodist preachers into the Protestant Episcopal Church (when the condition of their admission was that they should be re-ordained) shewed that he knew, that *his* ordination of them was invalid.

9. That Dr. Coke knew that Wesley had no *authority* to ordain him a Bishop, otherwise he would not have applied to Bishop Seabury to ordain him a Bishop.

10. That Dr. Coke acknowledged that he had exceeded the authority given him by Wesley and that Wesley disapproved of his proceedings.

11. That consequently he *knew* when Wesley appointed him a Superintendent of the Methodist Society, he did not ordain him a Bishop of the Church of God.

12. That Dr. Coke, by applying to Lord Liverpool to have himself consecrated a Bishop for India, showed that he regarded his former *appointment* invalid.

13. That Dr. Coke never would have submitted to such restrictions as the *bench* of Bishops should think necessary, did he conceive that he was a Bishop already.

14. That being educated and ordained in the Church of England he was not ignorant of her requirements, the first of which would be a reordination.

15. That the Methodists do not believe Presbyters and Bishops to be the *same order*, because—they have two distinct *forms* of ordination; one for Presbyters and another for Bishops; and, because they will not suffer those they call Presbyters to be called Bishops, until they have been a third time ordained.

Having thus minutely examined every argument by which it is pretended to establish the validity of Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke, I have shown conclusively, not only that Wesley did *not* ordain him, but that Coke did not *believe* that he had ordained him, and that the whole transaction was destitute of even the *shadow* of validity. The validity of Dr. Coke's ordination, then, being completely destroyed, (and the validity of the present Methodist Ministry depending upon that—so that they must stand or fall together) it is plain, to a demonstration, that the Methodists have no *lawful* ministry, and that those they call their Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, are only *laymen*. And as there can be no *lawful* sacraments without a *lawful* ministry, it is equally plain they have no Sacraments. And as there cannot be a Church of Christ, unless there be a *lawful* ministry and *lawful* sacraments, it is equally plain, also, that the (so called) "Methodist Church" is not a Church of Christ.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUPPOSED ORDINATION OF FRANCIS ASBURY.

Having considered the supposed ordination of Dr. Coke to constitute him a *Bishop*, and proved that no such thing ever existed—having proved that Wesley did not make him one, —that he did not believe himself that he was one,—that the Methodists did not believe him one, although for their own purposes they pretended to do so; I will now go on to prove that Francis Asbury was not ordained a Bishop—that no letters of Episcopal orders were ever issued by John Wesley for that purpose, and consequently that no such commission was given to Dr. Coke to ordain Francis Asbury to the same Episcopal office which, it is pretended, he himself possessed.

That Asbury was not a Bishop from Wesley's appointment is evident from the letter written by Wesley, dated Bristol, Sept. 10, 1784, only eight days after he "laid hands" on Dr. Coke, and addressed to "Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and our Brethren in North America."

In this letter Wesley says, "I have appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint *Superintendents* over our Brethren in North America."

That he did not make him a Bishop by that appointment is also evident from the fact that Asbury was only a *layman* at that time, and was not ordained (the so called) Bishop, until the Conference at Baltimore, on the 27th day of December, 1784; and were there any other proof required that he was not made a Bishop by Wesley, when he was *appointed Superintendent*, it is afforded in the fact, that he was nearly 4000 miles distant at the time, Asbury being in America and Wesley in England. Thus you see that Asbury was not made Bishop by Wesley.

We will now examine these 'letters of Episcopal orders commissioning and directing' Dr. Coke to set apart Francis Asbury to be a Bishop. And lest you may have forgotten them, I will refer you to what the Methodists call the "letters of Episcopal orders,"* signed by John Wesley, and dated, Sept. 2nd, 1784. Is Mr. Asbury's name even mentioned in these so called letters of Episcopal orders?—is there the slightest allusion to his ordination in them? Where then is this boasted commission to be found? It is to be found no where except in the Methodist Book of Discipline, Chapter 1, Section 1!

It is certain Mr. Asbury never heard of them, for on the subject of *succession* and *rebaptizing* being much agitated in New York, he says; "I will tell the world what I rest my authority upon. 1. Divine authority. 2. Seniority in America. 3. The election of the general conference. 4. My ordination by Thomas Coke, &c. 5. Because the signs of an apostle have been seen in me."† Not one word about these letters of Episcopal orders! I challenge all the Methodists living to produce them. I defy them to prove that

---

* Page 12. † Journal, Vol. III, p. 168.

this assertion in their Book of Discipline is other than a wilful falsehood, bearing with it not even the shadow of truth!

Hear what Mr. Wesley himself says *four years after* Mr. Asbury was made the (so called) Bishop.

"TO THE REV. FRANCIS ASBURY.

LONDON, Sept. 20, 1788.

There is indeed a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the Americans, and the relation wherein I stand to all the Methodists. You are the elder brother of the American Methodists; I am, under God, the father of the whole family. Therefore, I naturally care for you all in a manner no other person can do. Therefore, I, in a measure, provide for you all; for the supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could not provide, were it not for me—were it not that I not only permit him to collect, but also support him in so doing.

But in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid, both the Doctor (Coke) and you differ from me. I study to be *little;* you study to be *great.* I *creep,* you *strut along.* I found a *school;* you a *college*! nay, and call it after your own names. O, beware! Do not seek to be something! Let me be nothing, and Christ be all in all.

One instance of this, your greatness, has given me great concern. How can you, how *dare* you, suffer yourself to be called a Bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought!—Men may call me a knave or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content. But they shall never, by my consent, call me Bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.

Thus my dear Franky, I have told you all that is in my heart. And let this, when I am no more seen, bear witness how sincerely, I am your affectionate friend and brother,

Vol. XIII, p. 58. JOHN WESLEY."

Is not such falsity as this assumed commission enough to make one shudder, and practiced too by a Society calling itself a Church of Christ. Wesley "though dead yet speaketh;" his letter, now that he is "no more seen," bears witness how sincerely he loved the truth—how emphatically he condemned his followers.

This letter is a remarkable document and was written *four years* after he appointed Coke and Asbury Superintendents. He now had time for reflection—he now had time for a further and more deliberate investigation of the authority of Presbyters to ordain; and however he might, for a season, have been blinded by the sophistical book of Sir Peter King, so as to suppose Presbyters and Bishops were the *same order;* yet, now he gives his more mature judgment, that they were not; for what is the meaning of the last clause in his letter, when he speaks of the Presbyterians?

It is well known to be a tenet of the Presbyterians that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and many of them do not scruple to call themselves Bishops. In reference to this fact it is, that Wesley says in that letter, "Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better." That is, let the Presbyterians, if they please, call themselves *Bishops,* but let not the Methodists follow their example—let them know their calling better than to call themselves Bishops, when they are not.

The most ingenious individual that ever lived could not twist that letter so as to make Asbury a Bishop. It declares in plain terms that he is not one, and asks; "How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a Bishop;" and yet Dr. Coke did for Asbury, precisely what Wesley did for Coke; he laid his hands on him and prayed over him; and if, in Wesley's judgment, this imposition of hands and prayer by a Presbyter, did not make Asbury a Bishop, neither could they in Wesley's judgment, have made Coke a Bishop; for Coke's authority to ordain was the same as Wesley's, (which was no authority at all) both of them being Presbyters of the Church of England; and therefore it is proved clearly and undeniably, that in appointing Coke and Asbury to be "Superintendents" of the Methodist Society, Wesley did not ordain them Bishops.

Were any more proof wanting we have only to refer to Dr. Coke's letter to Bishop Seabury, May 14, 1791, in which he says, "Mr. Asbury our resident *Superintendent* is a great and good man. He possesses, and justly, the esteem of all the preachers and most of the people. Now if the general convention of the clergy consented that he should be consecrated Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the supposition of a reunion, a very capital hindrance would be removed out of the way." Again he says, "If the two houses of the convention of the clergy would consent to your consecration of Mr. Asbury and me as Bishops of the Methodist Society, &c."

Thus you see that the assertion contained in the Book of Discipline with regard to Asbury is, like the rest, untrue; for were he already a Bishop, by the imposition of the hands of Dr. Coke, would Dr. Coke apply to Bishop Seabury of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America to make him one, and that nearly *seven years* after he (Dr. Coke) had gone through a mock ordination of him?

Let us now sum up what we have proved on this occasion and then judge for yourselves whether Methodism can be a Church of God.

1. That Wesley did not *ordain* Asbury a Bishop when he *appointed* him Superintendent, as he was then only a *layman* and nearly 4000 miles distant from John Wesley.

2. That no such letters of Episcopal orders were ever given by John Wesley to Dr. Coke to ordain Asbury a Bishop and therefore, that the assertion in the Book of Discipline is false.

3. That the letter of John Wesley, dated Bristol, Sept. 10, 1784, only eight days after he laid his hands on Coke, proves him to be a Superintendent.

4. That Wesley's letter from London to Mr. Asbury, (written *four* years after the pretended ordination) dated Sept. 20, 1788, calls him to account for his presumption in usurping the name of Bishop.

5. That Dr. Coke knew Mr. Asbury was not a Bishop; for had he been one, why did he apply to Bishop Seabury to ordain him one; thereby acknowledging that his own was a mock ordination and possessed no validity.

Put all these things together and then judge for yourselves.

CHAPTER V.

THAT THE GENERAL CONFERENCE HELD AT BALTIMORE DID NOT AT THAT TIME UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVE THOMAS COKE AND FRANCIS ASBURY AS THEIR BISHOPS.

Lee, in his "Short History," gives the following account of these men first calling themselves Bishops in the minutes of their conference.

"In the course of this year (1787) Mr. Asbury reprinted the general minutes; but in a *different form* from what they were before. The title of this pamphlet was as follows:—

"A form of discipline for the ministers, preachers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America; considered and *approved* at a Conference held at Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, on Monday, the 27th day of December, 1784*****

"In this discipline there were thirty one sections and sixty three questions, with answers to them all.

"The third question in the second section, and the answer, read thus:

"Q. Is there any other business to be done in Conference?

"A. The electing and ordaining of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.

"This was the first time that our Superintendents ever gave themselves the title of *Bishops* in the minutes. *They changed the title themselves without the consent of the Conference.*"

Thus it appears a fraud was practised by one of these Superintendents to get himself recognised as a Bishop—no less a fraud than altering the minutes of the Conference! and this, too, by endeavoring to make it appear to the world, that they had been recognised as Bishops by the Conference since the first foundation of the Methodist Society in 1784!—whereas the Conference had only recognised them as Superintendents—the office to which Wesley had appointed them, and this alteration of their title for this purpose, by *themselves*, took place in 1787!

Lee, in his "History," goes on to remark,

"At the next Conference they asked the preachers if the word *Bishop* might stand in the minutes; seeing that it was a scripture name, and the *meaning* of the *word* Bishop was the same as that of Superintendent."

Observe here the reason assigned for assuming the title of Bishop. It was not that Wesley had ordained them to that office, as stated in the Book of Discipline, which says that Wesley solemnly set apart Dr. Coke for the Episcopal office and commisssioned him to ordain Asbury a Bishop also. No, Coke knew better than that;—he knew that he was not a Bishop, or else why would he write to Bishop Seabury to make him one, and that *four years* after this fraud was committed—why would he write to Lord Liverpool to endeavour to obtain the consent of the English Bishops to his consecration for India, when he knew that his appointment (if he succeeded) depended on a reordination. The reason assigned for this piece of deception is, "because the *word* Bishop" *meant* "Superintendent!" So it also means an "overseer," but is every overseer therefore a Bishop? So the word *Presbyter* means "an old man;" but is every old man therefore a Presbyter? So the word "Deacon" means "a servant;" but is every servant therefore a Deacon? It is evident from this transaction, that Coke and Asbury did not dare to assign Wesley's "appointment" as the ground for their assuming the title of Bishop; otherwise they would not have given such a school-boy reason for their unjustifiable act.

Lee, in his "History," then goes on further to remark:

"Some of the preachers opposed the alteration and wished to retain the former title (that of superintendent) but a *majority* of the preachers agreed to let the word *Bishop* remain; and in the annual minutes for the next year, the first question is; "Who are the *Bishops* of our Church for the United States"?

Thus was consummated one of the most startling frauds of modern times; and the whole Methodist Society has, ever since, been led to believe, that Wesley ordained Dr. Coke a Bishop, and then commissioned him to ordain Asbury a Bishop and that these two were actually recognised and called Bishops by the Methodist Conference since the first foundation of their Society in 1784: and what is more, this fraud is perpetrated to the present day, as may be seen by referring to their Book of Discipline (Chap. 1, Section 1,) which I have already quoted.

Now when did this "imposition of hands" on Mr. Asbury by Dr. Coke take place? We learn from Asbury's Journal, vol. 1, page 378, that it took place at the conference in Baltimore, when he was ordained Deacon, Elder and *Superintendent* on the 25th, 26th and 27th days of December 1784;* whereas it was not until 1787, that the minutes were altered; and it was not until the "next Conference" afterwards that the Superintendents were "received" as Bishops! And when the Conference did consent to "receive them as *Bishops*," it was not done "*unanimously*" but was the act of only "a majority" of the preachers. And thus are the Methodists imposed on until this very hour.

It is enough to make one shudder, when contemplating the manner in which these men attempted to thrust themselves into the chief office of the christian ministry. The recollection of it appears to have grievously weighed upon Dr. Coke's conscience, when he afterwards so earnestly wrote to Bishop Seabury to ordain him and Asbury *Bishops!* And to Bishops White and Seabury to ordain their preachers over again! and well might it weigh upon his conscience! The wonder is, it did not drive him into a madhouse. Asbury tells us, "I was shocked when first informed of the intention of these my brethren (Dr. Coke and Richard Whatcoat) in coming to this country; it may be of God,"† he says; and Wesley himself tells us the effect it had upon him, when he heard of Asbury claiming to be a Bishop. He tells us it made him "*shudder*;" and well it might.

Notwithstanding their high-handed assumption of the *title* of Bishop, still these men were uneasy. The fact was still staring them in the face, (and the world knew it) that Wesley had only appointed them Superintendents of the Methodist Society *under him*, and however they might claim to be Bishops—and however they might alter the name in the minutes—still, Bishops in the Church of God, they were not! Something then must be done to get around this matter, and convince the people; 1. That Wesley was a Bishop; 2. That Wesley ordained Coke a Bishop; and 3. That Coke ordained Asbury a Bishop! One would suppose, when Asbury had Wesley's letter, (dated Sept. 20. 1788) in his pocket, declaring that he, Wesley, was no Bishop, and that Asbury was no Bishop, that this would not be a very easy matter to accomplish. But these men did not stick at trifles; they had already fabricated a new set of minutes for their Society to get the title of Bishops; and they were determined to go all lengths sooner than fail in their project to be accounted *real* Bishops. The Bishops of *the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* had now for some time been consecrated; Coke and Asbury knew that *their* commission was authentic; that *they* had been consecrated in England and Scotland by *lawful* Bishops; and that the Church had received them as Bishops, in a regular succession from the apostles.—Coke and Asbury knew all this; and along side of these men, as Methodist "Superintendents," they felt their littleness, although they had assumed the name of what they so much coveted! They knew that they had the *name* of Bishop, and that was all! They had no succession to point to! Let us see, then, how they proceeded to get the *reality*.—At one of their Conferences, held in the year 1789, Mr. Lee, in his "History," informs us (p. 142) that:

"The Bishops (that is Coke and Asbury) introduced a question in the annual minutes, which was as follows:

"Q. Who are the persons that exercise the Episcopal office in the Methodist Church in Europe and America?

"A. John Wesley, Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury, by regular order and *Succession!!*"

The next question was asked *differently* from what it ever had been in any of the former minutes, which stands thus:

"Q. Who have been elected by the unanimous suffrages of the General Conference to superintend the Methodist connexion in America?"

"A. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury."

---

* It is worthy of remark that in the certificate of ordination (in said page) given by Dr. Coke to Mr. Asbury, he, Dr. Coke, signs himself *Superintendent* and licenses Asbury a *Superintendent* also.

† Journal, vol. 1 p. 376.

The drift of these questions and answers can be seen at once. Their object is to make it appear (1) That it was the *Conference* and not Wesley, which appointed them *Superintendents!* and (2) to make it appear, that Wesley was a Bishop, and ordained them Bishops, and that thus they have a regular *succession* from a lawful *Bishop*. Now let it be remembered, that these questions were introduced by Coke and Asbury themselves! They saw the full drift of them, although the Conference might not have seen it! Calmly and without prejudice review this proceeding; and then taking it in connexion with the *fact* that they fabricated a new set of minutes to get the *name* of a Bishop, and with the fact that Asbury had in his possession Wesley's letter declaring that *he* was no Bishop, and that Asbury was no Bishop. I say calmly and without prejudice review this proceeding, in connexion with these *facts* and then say, whether modern or ancient times afford a more daring, or unhallowed scheme, than this presents of men undertaking to usurp the office and authority of a Christian Bishop!

Let us now see what we have proved under this head.

1. That the Conference held at Baltimore in 1784, did not receive Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury Bishops *at that time.*

2. That they were not received as Bishops by the Conference until the minutes were altered, in years after, by these designing men.

3. That they were not received *unanimously* even then, but only by a *majority* of the preachers.

4. That the minutes had to be altered in two different Conferences before they could complete their unhallowed scheme.

5. That Wesley denied in his letter dated London, Sept. 20, 1788, that *he* was a Bishop.

6. That therefore the Answer to the Question in the minutes of the Conference in 1789 making Wesley a Bishop is a direct and wilful untruth, because told by men, who, not only knew Wesley's sentiments, but had his letter in their possession denying that he was a Bishop.

And now, dear Brethren, I appeal to any honest, God fearing man, whether that can be a Church of the living God which is conceived in schism, cradled in deception, matured in imposture and continued in falsehood? Can that be a Church of Christ which, knowingly, willingly and designedly imposes upon the ignorant, by asserting in its Book of Discipline the most fearful untruths that ever were uttered by men? Can that be founded upon the "Rock of ages," whose ministry is built upon falsehood and deception? Let not the Methodist any longer decry the pious frauds and lying wonders of the Church of Rome; let him first pull the beam out of his *own* eye and then he will see clearly to pull the mote out of his *brother's* eye.

But says the Methodist: "We have for some time shaken off our connexion with the Episcopal Methodists in the United States; we have found the stream impure and have sought the purer fountain; we *now* derive our ministry from the genuine stock, planted in England by Wesley's own hands; there can be no mistake here; we must be right this time." What! are you ashamed of the mother that bore you? Do you stamp with bastardy the parent that begot you? do you deny her Episcopacy, repudiate her ministry, renounce her *Succession?* Undutiful children!

"Sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child."

When did this clearer light burst in upon your benighted souls—when did you drive from your ranks the unhallowed intruder? Have you acknowledged your error to your American Brethren and branded their system as a *falsehood, a fable?* What then becomes of all that you have said *in favour of Episcopacy* up to the year 1832, when you passed a resolution that it "be superseded." If it is false *now*, it was false then; so by your own admission you wrote and preached lies up to that period! I thank you for your admission; that is honest, plain dealing. Well, then, as you go back to England for your ministry, let us examine that subject next and see what Methodism gains by the change.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SUPPOSED ORDINATIONS FOR ENGLAND.

We are informed that, "From other sources we learn that early in the year 1789 Wesley ordained three other ministers without sending them out of England. Their names were Alexander Mather, Thomas Rankan and Henry Moore. The last of these has published a copy of the letters of orders given him on this occasion. They are dated February 27th, 1789"

Now, that this whole statement is a fabrication, must appear evident to every thinking man. In the first place Mr. Wesley tells us,

"2. Lord King's 'Account of the Primitive Church,' convinced me many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our Travelling Preachers. But I have still refused, not only for peace' sake, but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the national Church to which I belonged.

"3. But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are Bishops who have a legal jurisdiction; in America there are none, neither any parish ministers. So that for some hundred miles together there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end; and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest."

This letter bears date Sept. 10, 1784, and is directed to "Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and our Brethren in North America." In it you see, although *for many years importuned, from time to time, to ordain preachers for England, Wesley refused, being determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the Church to which he belonged.* And besides all this, he assigns his reasons for refusing to ordain for England. 1. That there is a wide difference between England and America. 2. That there are Bishops in England who have a legal jurisdiction. 3. That in America for some hundred miles together there were no Ministers to administer the Sacraments; from which he concludes that he is at full liberty to set apart some persons for that country; but that his *scruples* would not suffer him to ordain for England, as he would be not only *violating order*, but *invading the rights* of others.

Now is it likely that a man entertaining such *scruples* would in a few short years afterwards do violence to his conscience, by ordaining these men, and at the same time never offer one excuse in palliation of his conduct? Can any reasonable man suppose that he would be guilty of so palpable a contradiction and yet never utter one syllable in defence of such inconsistency!

Again: Upon his setting apart men for America and Scotland, we find every publication in the United Kingdom, as well as in Scotland, engaged in the controversy, approving of, or condemning the act,—we find the voice of the Bishops of the Church of England, throughout the length and breadth of the land, protesting against his usurped authority, and yet, we find not, in the publications of those days, one solitary expression in condemnation or approval of his ordaining for England. Can any one in his senses suppose that those who *combated a distant evil*, would lay down their arms in *mute submission at its nearer approach?*—or is it at all probable that those Bishops who were so strenuous in their opposition to a proceeding that affected them but *indirectly and remotely*, would be "*dumb dogs*" when their *rights were invaded*, where they had a *legal jurisdiction?* Nevertheless we must believe these improbabilities; nay, more; that the sacraments ceased to be administered in England before we can give credence to the ordination of Alexander Mather, Thomas Rancan and Henry Moore.

That Mr. Wesley, in an unguarded moment, assumed the right of appointing Preachers for America and Scotland I am ready to admit. He has recorded it—the Arminian Magazine defended it—the publications of those days acknowledged it—the Bishops of the United Kingdom raised their voice against it; but I cannot find the most indirect hint—the slightest allusion whatever to his having done so for England in his Journal, Sermons, Letters, Arminian Magazines, Minutes of Conference,—or, in contemporary writings, Bishops' charges, &c. &c.

We are told, "*we learn these things from other sources*," and also, "*the present age seems full of enterprise, and persons are not satisfied to take things upon trust. Reason is not to be put off with bare assertions. No; men will examine for themselves.*" Now surely the Methodists cannot be annoyed if *we* examine for ourselves—if we call upon them to give us something beyond *bare assertions*. Past experience has taught us not *to take things upon trust;* we would therefore ask of them to give us a little information touching these *other sources* of which they speak. And here I would forewarn them that we will expect some *proof*—something beyond the *bare assertions* of an *interested* biographer; for until these *other sources* are clearly and distinctly pointed out, we shall regard the whole matter as unworthy of credit—in other words, *a Fable.*

One would suppose that enough has been said on this head to disprove the alleged ordination of these men, but the subject is not yet examined.

There is nothing more common than to hear Methodists speak of the *Sacraments being constantly administered in the preaching houses at home*, and, from the arrogant assumption and false assertions of that body, the ignorant and unwary are duped into the belief that the Preachers were permitted to administer these rites. Now, I wish it to be clearly understood that, to the hour of Mr. Wesley's death, no Preacher ever presumed to administer

the Sacraments with his permission. It is true they were administered in the preaching houses occasionally; but it was *invariably* by *regularly ordained Clergymen of the Church of England.* Hear Mr. Wesley on the subject.

In writing to Mr. Hall, who *pressed him to renounce the Church*, Wesley says; "We believe it would not be right for us to administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission so to do from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the Apostles. And yet we allow these Bishops are the successors of those who were dependent on the Bishop of Rome."

"We believe there is, and always was, in every Christian Church, (whether dependent on the Bishop of Rome or not) an outward priesthood, ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein, by men authorised to act as Ambassadors of Christ, and Stewards of the mysteries of God." Vol. II, p. 4.

Such were Mr. Wesley's views with regard to the Sacraments in Dec. 30, 1745, and in his Sermon on "The Ministerial office, preached at Cork, May 4, 1789, and published in the Arminian Magazine in 1790, the year before he died, he speaks the same language.—Hear him:

"11. In 1744, all the Methodist Preachers had their first Conference. But none of them dreamed, that the being called to preach gave them any right to administer sacraments.—And when the question was proposed, 'In what light are we to consider ourselves?' it was answered, 'As *extraordinary messengers*, raised up to provoke the *ordinary* ones to jealousy.' In order hereto, one of our first rules was given to each Preacher, 'You are to do *that part* of the work which we appoint.' But *what work* was this? Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments; to exercise the priestly office? Such a design never entered into our mind; it was the farthest from our thoughts; and if any preacher had taken such a step we should have looked upon it as a palpable breach of this rule, and consequently as a recantation of our connexion.

"12. For supposing (what I utterly deny) that the receiving you as a Preacher, at the same time gave an authority to administer the sacraments; yet it gave you no other authority than to do *it*, or anything else,' where I appoint. But where did I appoint you to do this? Nowhere at all. Therefore by this very rule you are excluded from doing it. And in doing it, you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which was wholly and solely to preach the gospel.

"13. It was several years after our society was formed, before any attempt of this kind was made. The first was, I apprehend, at Norwich. One of our Preachers there yielded to the importunity of a few of the people, and baptized their children. But as soon as it was known, he was informed it must not be, unless he designed to leave our connexion.—He promised to do so no more; and I suppose he kept his promise.

"18. I wish all of you who are vulgarly termed Methodists would seriously consider what has been said. And particularly you whom God hath commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow from hence, that ye are commissioned to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this, for ten or twenty years after ye began to preach. Ye did not then, like Korah, Dathan and Abiram, 'seek the priesthood also.' Ye knew 'no man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.' O contain yourselves within your own bounds; be content with preaching the gospel." Vol. VII, p. 277.

These we are told "*were once Mr. Wesley's views and he carried them into practice.*" In other words Mr. Wesley never suffered any of the Preachers to administer the Sacraments. We proceed to the alleged copy of the "letters of orders" given to Henry Moore; (the only proof of Mr. Wesley's ordaining for England;) and comparing these two statements together any honest man must acknowledge that the whole is a fabrication, got up to deceive the credulous and unsuspecting.

"Know all men by these presents, that I, John Wesley, late fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, did, on the day of the date hereof, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers) set apart Henry Moore, for the office of a Presbyter in the Church of God, a man whom I judge qualified, to feed the flock of Christ, and to administer the sacraments of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England; and as such, I do hereby recommend him to all whom it may concern. In testimony whereof, I set my hand and seal. JOHN WESLEY."

This document bears date, Feb'y 27th, 1789, and in it we are told that Mr. Wesley set apart Henry Moore to "*administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper.*" but on May 4th, 1789, *two months and seven days afterwards*, Mr. Wesley *utterly denies* that he ever appointed any of the Methodist Preachers to administer the sacraments—that *such a design never entered into his mind—that it was farthest from his thoughts, and that if any Preacher had taken such a step, he would have looked upon it as a palpable breach of his rule and consequently as a recantation of the Methodist connexion.*' And mark well, we are told that *he carried these views into practice;* from which it follows, that Henry Moore, Alexander Mather

or Thomas Rancan were not set apart to administer the sacraments; that is to say; the alleged letters of orders are a fabrication and consequently that Mr. Wesley never ordained for England.

To illustrate the foregoing:

Suppose that a highly respectable individual "of good fame and reputation," during the whole course of his life, protested against certain illegal and unwarrantable proceedings; —that he advertised in the public prints that he never gave a note of hand payable at sight to any individual in the United Kingdom of England and Ireland;—that no note of the kind was ever presented to him or his Bankers while he lived;—that after his decease a certain individual demanded payment of his Executors, for a note of hand, payable on demand and due for many years;—that the aforsesaid individual was in a state of insolvency for years and hard pressed for money during that period;—that notwithstanding his pecuniary embarrassments he never sought either interest on the note or payment of the principal;—that to redeem his sinking credit he never even hinted to any one that he held such a note;—that he afterwards put it into the court for collection; do you think that any jury of twelve men from Derry to Cape Clear, from Carlisle to the Straits of Dover, would recognise it as *genuine*;—would pronounce it other than a *forgery!*

Precisely in the same situation stands the case of the pretended ordination of Alexander Mather, Thomas Ranean and Henry Moore. Mr. Wesley, during his whole life, protested against any of his Preachers' administering the sacraments;—he published his protest in the Arminian Magazine, not only in the early period of his ministry, but at its close in 1790, and subsequent to this pretended ordination;—he was importuned, from time to time, to ordain his Preachers, which he not only refused, but published his refusal in the above year;—the Preachers were urged in vain by the people to administer the sacraments, and they dared not;—the cause of Methodism was suffering from the want of the sacraments at the hand of the Preachers; and yet neither Alexander Mather, Thomas Rancan nor Henry Moore, ever came forward to prop their cherished system by the administration of the sacraments. No; they never put forth the least claim,—the slightest pretensions to the Priesthood, although we are told that they were ordained Presbyters of the Church of God for the alleged purpose of administering the sacraments!!

The Methodists may rest assured these things will not pass. The evidence of every *witness* is against them—the decision of the *jury* is against them—the sentence of the *Court* is against them and they are pronounced GUILTY.

To examine the matter further:

In the Minutes of Conference, held at Bristol, July 27th, 1790, I find the names of these three men in the *list of Preachers* and not the slightest allusion is made to their alleged ordination. Alexander Mather is stationed at Wakefield, Thomas Ranean in London, Henry Moore at Bristol. This Conferenee was held preeisely one year and five months after the alleged "letters of orders were given to Henry Moore," in which he is called a "*Presbyter* of the Church of God;" yet he is classed with those Preachers, whom Mr. Wesley tells us, he *never appointed to administer the sacraments or to exercise the Priestly office.* Would those men, think you, submit to such treatment with impunity, were they what they are stated to have been;—would they never have asserted their claim to a pre-eminence over their less favoured brethren?—would they never have uttered a word in vindication of their characters?—would they have suffered themselves to be ranked among the "*thieves and robbers*," who climbed up some other way into the fold? I trow not. This is too great an absurdity to be believed.

In his Journal Mr. Wesley records the most trifling occurrences, and when the teaching of his preachers *to read and to spell* was considered worthy of a place in the Minutes of Conferenee;* surely, if on February 27th, 1789, he assumed the power and authority of a Bishop, in ordaining any of these men, he would not have passed it over in silence.

Again, in a Tract written Dec. 11, 1789, we have a further confirmation, if such be required, of the truth of my position, that Mr. Wesley never ordained any of his Preachers for England.

"FURTHER THOUGHTS ON SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH."

"1. From a child I was taught to love and reverence the Scripture, the oraeles of God, and next to these, to esteem the primitive fathers, the writers of the three first centuries. Next after the Primitive Church I esteemed our own (the Chureh of England) as the most scriptural national Church in the world. I therefore not only assented to all the doctrines, but observed all the rubric in the Liturgy; and that with all possible exaetness, even at the peril of my life.

"2. In this judgment, and with this spirit I went to America strongly attached to the Bible, the Primitive Chureh, and the Church of England, from which I would not vary in one jot or tittle on any accouut whatever. In this spirit I returned as regular a Clergyman

* Vol. VIII, p. 317.

as any in the three kingdoms, till after not being permitted to preach in the Churches,* I was constrained to *preach in the open air.*

"3. Here was my first *irregularity;* and it was not voluntary, but constrained. The second was *extemporary* prayer. This likewise I believed to be my bounden duty, for the sake of those who desired me to watch over their souls. I could not in conscience refrain from it; neither from accepting those who desired to serve me as *sons in the gospel.*"

He then goes on at great length to *caution* his followers against leaving the Church and concludes by saying,

"7. I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it when I am no more seen. I do and will do all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many of them will separate from it (although I am apt to think not one half, perhaps not a third of them.) These will be so *bold and injudicious* as to form a separate party, which consequently will dwindle away into a dry, dull, separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice, will ever separate from it." Vol. XIII, p. 239. "JOHN WESLEY."

This is a most important document, and had we nothing else, from the pen of John Wesley it is sufficient to disprove the libel upon his character, that *he ordained ministers for England.* In this he mentions all the *irregularities* of which he had been guilty as a Clergyman of the Church of England, so far as the discipline of that Church was concerned in that country: yet strange to say there is not one word about the ordination of Henry Moore or his associates! Does this bear upon it the stamp of truth,—is it at all probable that he who entertained such *scruples* about ordaining for England in 1784, would in 1789 perpetrate one of the greatest irregularities of which he had ever been guilty, and not offer a syllable to justify his *violation of the established order of the Church to which he belonged?* This Tract you will perceive is dated Dec. 11, 1789, *nine months and twelve days after the alleged date of Henry Moore's letters of orders,* and not quite fifteen months before Wesley's death.

In a former place of this Review, I have proved that Wesley had no authority to ordain; but, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that he assumed the right to set apart these three men for England: Why did he confine himself to that number—why did he not ordain *all* the preachers? or why, after the death of Mr. Wesley, did not Alexander Mather, Thomas Rankan and Henry Moore, ordain others, a thing which they never pretended to do? If they were *Presbyters of the Church of God,* they had as much right to ordain others as Wesley had to ordain them. Why, then, did they not *openly* avow their commission and set apart others to administer the sacraments? Why, in the year 1797, did they suffer The New Methodists to separate from the old connexion, because they were *not permitted* to receive the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper at the hands of their Preachers; or why, in 1815, did they suffer "The Church or Primitive Methodists to separate from the old connexion," because the Conference in Dublin *determined* that their Preachers *should administer* the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper;" on which occasion *nine thousand* left, assigning as their reason that the "The Conference party had forfeited the name of *Wesleyan!*" Why did they permit these divisions in their body, when the open avowal of their ordination and their ordaining others would have put a stop to the whole transaction: for if they were ordained, they had as much right to ordain others, as Wesley had to ordain them? Why did they suffer the whole Methodist body to go as sheep without a shepherd until the year 1836, at which time they held their FIRST ORDINATION; 45 *years after the death of their Founder!* Answer these questions who can? Give *proof!* "Reason is not to be put off with bare assertions."

That I do not confine myself to *bare assertions* has been abundantly shown; and as in other instances I shall give *proof* in this also.

"Minutes at the 93 annual Conference, began in Birmingham, July 27, 1836.

"Question XXIV. What is the decision of the Conference on the ordination of our Ministers by *imposition of hands?*"

"Answer. The Conference, after mature deliberation, resolves that the Preachers who are *this year* to be publicly admitted into full connexion, shall be ordained by *imposition of hands;* that this shall be our standing rule and usage in *future years,* and that any rule *of a contrary nature,* which may be in existence, shall be, and is hereby rescinded."

Thus you see, that the first *mock* ordination was held in the year 1836, by Messrs. Bunting and Jackson, a very curious account of which appeared, some years since, in the "Watchman," a few numbers of which were put into the Post Office before the Confer-

*This was only for a short period and in a few places. In his Journal January 19, 1783, Wesley tells us, "I preached at St. Thomas' Church in the afternoon, and at St. Swithon's in the evening; *the tide is now turned so that I have more invitations to preach in Churches than I can accept of;*" and the last event recorded in his Journal is that on Sunday 24, 1790, he preached in Spitalfield's Church in the morning and in St. Paul's, Shadwell, in the afternoon.

ence men, who were ashamed of the business, sent down an order to suppress the publication. At this ordination Mr. Bunting declared that *he himself had never been ordained.* What think you of that? He who never was ordained undertook to ordain others! yet, we are told "Methodism is founded on the Rock of Ages—Her 'place of defence' is amunition of rocks." What an absurdity—what a burlesque upon common sense!! How can a man give that which he has not himself? You or I could write out and sign magistrates' commissions, or attornies' certificates, but such documents would be useless—mere forgeries, and would only pass among the ignorant and illiterate.

Before the year 1836, the Preachers were received into full connexion by a vote of Conference, but since that time they go through a *mock* ordination with "imposition of hands." And here I would ask if the laying on of hands, in ordination, were requisite to constitute a valid ministry since the year 1836, why was it not practiced before? We have no instance of any Church setting persons apart for the Ministry without observing this practice, and Calvin speaking of ordination says: "Since we see that this rite (the laying on of hands) was in perpetual use by the apostles, *their constant practice should be received by us, in the place of a command.*" I repeat the question; if laying on of hands, in ordination, were requisite to constitute a valid ministry since the year 1836, why was it not practised before? Simply because the memory of John Wesley was too fresh and they dared not go thus far;—the facts were too glaring to be got over;—the words of their Founder had not ceased to be respected: and now that I have examined the alleged ordination for England; what do the Methodists gain by the change? [They have gone from the frying pan into the fire.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE SUPPOSED ORDINATIONS FOR SCOTLAND.

In his Journal, August 1, 1785, Wesley says: "Having with a few select friends, weighed the matter thoroughly, *I yielded to their judgment*, and set apart three of our well tried preachers, John Pawson, Thomas Hanby and Joseph Taylor, to minister in Scotland." Is not this an astounding acknowledgment, and coming from the pen of Wesley himself?—After having had a long discussion with his friends, who were interested in the matter, and who no doubt persuaded him that it was for the glory of God, he *yielded to their judgment*, and set apart these men! He was now an old man of *eighty-three*, and for the sake of peace and relieving himself from the importunate entreaties of his friends he consulted *not his own* judgment, but gave himself up entirely to the judgment of *others*, to be twisted and turned at their pleasure; and what was the moving cause that influenced him to act thus fearfully? Let Wesley speak for himself.

"After Dr. Coke's return from America, many of our friends begged I would consider the case of Scotland, where we had been labouring so many years, and had seen so little fruit of our labours. Multitudes indeed have set out well, but they were soon turned out of the way; chiefly by their Ministers either disputing against the truth, or refusing to admit them to the Lord's Supper, yea, or to baptize their children, unless they would promise to have no fellowship with the Methodists. Many who did so, soon lost all they had gained, and became more the children of hell than before. To prevent this, I at length consented to take the same step with regard to Scotland, which I had done with regard to America." Vol. XIII, p. 223.

Here is the clue to the solution of the whole proceeding. Wesley set apart men for America because they had few clergymen to administer the Sacraments, and for Scotland because, although they had abundance of clergymen, they either disputed against what he considered the truth, or refused the sacraments to those who attended the Methodist Meetings, and he winds up by telling us that those who obeyed the wishes of their Ministers, in leaving the Methodists and cleaving to Presbyterianism, became more the children of hell than they were before; that is to say; returned to the soul destroying error of Calvinism, which he conceived was "not the Gospel."

You are aware that the subject of election and reprobation was the great absorbing topic of those days, and so warmly and zealously was it debated that it rung from every pulpit in the length and breadth of Scotland. Mr. Wesley considered that such preaching was ruinous to souls, and that, even admitting they had the ordinances of religion, they would only receive them to their damnation, as they had "not the Gospel." Here is the

unravelling of the mystery: he thought that Methodism, though defective, was better than no religion at all; for there can be no religion where there is "not the Gospel:" and besides all this, there were no Bishops in Scotland "with whose legal jurisdiction he could interfere." Entertaining such ideas he set apart three *well tried* preachers to minister in Scotland, hoping that the little leaven of their ministrations would leaven the whole lump, —that the Gospel, as preached by these men, would counteract what Wesley considered to be the baneful effects of Calvinism.

Hear Wesley's words and then judge for yourselves:

In writing to Miss Bishop, Oct. 18, 1778, he says: "Calvinism is not the Gospel. Few of the Methodists are now in danger of imbibing error from the Church Ministers; but they are in great danger of imbibing the grand error, Calvinism, from some of the Dissenting (Presbyterian) Ministers. Perhaps thousands have done it already, most of whom have drawn back to perdition. I see more instances of this than any one else can do; and on this ground also exhort all who would keep to the Methodists and from Calvinism to go to the Church and not to the meeting. But to speak freely, I myself find more life in the Church Prayers than in any formal extemporary prayer's of Dissenters." Vol. XIII, p. 134.

In his Journal, Vol, III, p. 276 he writes:

"I was not glad to hear that some of the Seceders had settled in these parts also.*— Those of them who have yet fallen in my way are more uncharitable than the Papists themselves. I never yet met a Papist who avowed the principle of murdering heretics: but a Seceding Minister being asked, "Would not you, if it was in your power, cut the throats of all the Methodists?" replied directly; "Why, did not Samuel hew Agag in pieces before the Lord?" I have not yet met a Papist in this kingdom who would tell me to my face, all but themselves must be damned. But I have seen Seceders enough who make no scruple to affirm, none but themselves could be saved. And this is the natural consequence of their doctrine."

In writing to Lady ——— Sept. 30, 1788, who at the request of a friend received money for the propagation of Calvinism, he says:

"What then? May I destroy souls because my friend desired it? ought you not rather to throw that money into the sea? O, let not any money, or any friend, move you to propagate a lie." Vol. XIII, p. 124.

Again, after writing sixty three pages he concludes:

"I think it (Calvinism) cannot be found in holy writ and that it is a plant which bears dismal fruit. An instance of which we have in Calvin himself, who confesses that he procured the burning to death of Michael Servetus, purely for differing from him in opinion in matters of religion." Vol. X, p. 266.

Again, after writing one hundred and ten pages on the subject he concludes: "Ah, poor Predestinarian—Where is your help? There is no help for you in your God. *Your* God! No; he is not yours; he never was; he never will be, He that made you, He that called you into being, has no pity upon you! He made you for this very end—to damn you; to cast you headlong into a lake of fire burning with brimstone! This was prepared for you or ever the world began." Vol. X, p. 480.

In these opinions is the prime, the moving cause, of Mr. Wesley setting apart these men for Scotland. He conceived that in Scotland they had not the Gospel—he knew that there were but a few Church of England Clergymen in that country, (Presbyterianism being the established religion,) and he believed it would be sinful in him not to do all in his power to rescue them from perdition.

CHAPTER VIII.

EPISCOPACY.

Let us now weigh the actions of Mr. Wesley in an impartial balance, and I feel convinced that there is not one disinterested person in five thousand that will not give his testimony against the fearful responsibility which he assumed; and while engaged in this consideration, I would ask you to divest your minds of any preconceived idea with respect to Church Government; that is to say: forget for a moment, if possible, that you are Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., and thereby place yourselves in a situation to give an unbiassed testimony.

---

* Tindaragee, in Ulster.

Up to the year 1746, Mr. Wesley was a rigid Churchman, believing firmly in the Episcopal form of Church Government existing in England, comprised of three orders, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. In 1746, he read "Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church" "*on the road*," on his way to Bristol. "In spite," he says "of the vehement prejudice of my education, I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draft; but *if* so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one order." Vol. II, p. 6. Here Mr. Wesley admits that *if* this book were correct Bishops and Presbyters were the same order, and *if* so that he had a right to set apart others for the Ministry. He tacitly admits that he did not study the question more than by the reading of this book "*on the road*," on his way to Bristol. Two years afterwards, (1748) when writing to a Clergyman, on the subject of ordination, he says: "I believe Bishops are empowered to do this, and have been so from the Apostolic age." Vol. VIII, p. 497. Again in 1755, nine years after he read Lord King's book, when he had time to think upon the subject, he tells us: "It is not clear to us, that Presbyters, so circumstanced as we are, may appoint or ordain others." Vol. XIII, p. 176. In the following year, he says: "As to *my own judgment*, I still believe 'the Episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical.' I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the Apostles.* But that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicon." Vol. XIII, p. 179. Again in 1761, fifteen years after he read Lord King's book, and years subsequent to his reading the "Irenicon," he says "I believe, (the ecclesiastical order established in England) is, in general, not only lawful, but highly commendable." Vol. XIII, p. 201. Add to these the "Book of Discipline," that Mr. Wesley "preferred the Episcopal mode of Church Government to any other." Chap. I, Section 1.

Here Mr. Wesley tells us: 1. That Bishops have a right to ordain. 2. That Presbyters have no right either to ordain or appoint. 3. That according to *his* judgment, the Episcopal form of Church government was scriptural and apostolical. 4. That the Ecclesiastical order established in England was not only lawful, but highly commendable. All this he tells us as the conviction of *his own judgment*, fifteen years after he read Lord King's book and many years subsequent to his reading the "Irenicon." Thus up to the year 1761, at least, whilst his judgment was in full vigour, he was a firm believer in Episcopacy, notwithstanding all he had read to the contrary. He was now *fifty-nine* years of age, strong in mind and body; but in the year 1784, without reading, as far as we can learn, anything else to change his mind in this particular, and at the advanced age of *eighty-two*, when his judgment, if not impaired, was easily wrought upon by ambitious men, he set apart Dr. Coke and others for America; and in the following year John Pawson and others for Scotland, *yielding to the judgment of a few select friends*. Add to these things his acknowledgment "To the Printer of the Dublin Chronicle," dated June 2, 1789, four years after the supposed ordination; "When I said: "I believe I am a scriptural Bishop," ('as much as any man in England and Europe,') "I spoke on Lord King's *supposition*, that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially one order." Vol. XIII. p. 238.

Now comparing these things together, I would venture to say, there is not one in five thousand disinterested men that would not condemn Mr. Wesley for disturbing the peace of the Christian world by assuming an authority to which he had not the shadow of a claim. And what reason have the Methodists to be proud of their supposed Ministry; seeing they derive it through the medium of designing men, who influenced their Founder, in his old age, to act contrary to his matured judgment, and that on the *supposition* of the correctness of a book which has been refuted a thousand times, and for which the Author was sorry long before its leaves were turned over by John Wesley "*on the road*" to Bristol.

We are told that "Mr. Wesley's opinions underwent an entire change," which was in part if not chiefly effected, by "the reading of two works, written by distinguished *Churchmen*."

The dishonesty which marks the rest of this "vindication of the Methodist Church" shows itself in this also. Lord King was not a *Churchman*. His family were Dissenters and he was educated in the principles of dissent from the Church of England. His principles, as a Dissenter, not allowing his admission into the English Universities, by the advice of his uncle, the celebrated John Locke, he went to the University at Leyden to pursue his education. Shortly after his return in 1692, and while a Dissenter when but twenty two years of age, he published his "Inquiry† &c., of the Primitive Church," in which owing to his immature judgment, he drew his conclusions from terms rather than facts.—In 1702 he published a "History of the Apostles' Creed," and, although evidencing great research, so objectionable was it, that Mosheim says of it: "Such as read this valuable

* Here you see he believed Episcopacy was taught in Scripture, but that it was not laid down as a command.

† To attach the more importance to this work it is dishonestly called by Methodists and others Lord King's *Account* of the Primitive Church, although the Author calls it an "*Inquiry*."

work would do well to consider that its learned Author, upon several occasions, has given us conjectures instead of proofs, and also that his conjectures are not always so happy as to justly command our assent." In 1706, he published "The Rights of the Christian Church asserted," which struck at the root of all religion, and called forth the censure of Dr. Calamy and others, but especially of Dr. George Hicks, who expressed himself as having doubts of Lord King's belief in Christianity, and sarcastically placed him in the *synagogue of the libertines.* Indeed, so great was the sensation produced by the last mentioned work that the House of Commons passed the following resolution in relation to it and others, and that too, when Lord King was a Member in the House:

"Resolved, That the said books are scandalous, seditious and blasphemous libels, highly reflecting on the Christian religion, and tend to promote immorality and atheism, and to create divisions, schisms and factions among her majesty's subjects, and ordered that the books be this day burnt by the common hangman."

Such was the estimation in which Lord King's works were held in his day. In 1713 he published a second edition of his "Inquiry" which, in part, effected the change in Mr. Wesley's mind, and so ably was it answered by the Rev. Mr. Sclater and so fully convinced was Lord King of the incompetency and inaccuracy of his own work, that from a *Dissenter* he became a *Churchman;* and with that generosity which is ever found in a great mind, he advanced Mr. Sclater in the Church as a proof of the favourable opinion which he entertained of his work. So much for Lord King's *Churchmanship* when he wrote his Inquiry, and this is the book so much lauded by the Methodist body, though repudiated by its Author. Truly they are easily pleased in this particular at least!

Let us now consider that text book of Modern Methodism, Stillingfleet's "Irenicon," and then judge whether the followers of Wesley, or Dissenters in general, can claim much from him in support of their schismatical proceedings.

Were we to form an opinion from the importance attached to the above named individual by the Methodists and their associates in schism, we must suppose that Bishop Stillingfleet was "*The Church*," instead of what he really was, a humble Presbyter in her communion, when he wrote the "Irenicon." To explain myself more fully upon this point it will be necessary to go a little into particulars.

Bishop Stillingfleet was educated during the time of the Commonwealth, when the Church and Monarchy were all but annihilated, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were under the control of Presbyterian and Independent ministers. Such was the state of things when he received his education. In 1659, at the age of twenty-five, he published his "Irenicon," which it appears was instrumental in effecting a partial change in the mind of Mr. Wesley. Owing to the continued labours of that good, but erring man, he had neither time nor opportunity to examine for himself; consequently, as in the case of Lord King, he took every thing *on trust* and acted accordingly. Now, if it can be proved that upon mature deliberation and deeper research Bishop Stillingfleet had reason to change his views and correct the erroneous impressions which they were likely to make upon weak and unstable minds, I am of opinion that his testimony will not go for much in the estimation of any one whose opinion is worth the having.

In the Preface to an ordination Sermon preached by him in 1685, he thus alludes to the "Irenicon." "I did adventure to publish at that time, hoping by that means to bring over those to a compliance with the Church of England (then to be re-established) who stood off upon the supposition that Christ had appointed a Presbyterian Government to be always continued in his Church, and therefore they thought Prelacy was to be detested, as an unlawful usurpation. * * * I dare challenge any man to produce one passage in the whole book that tended to encourage faction or schism, or opposition to the Church of England; but, on the contrary, *I endeavoured to recommend the Episcopal government as having the advantage of all others, and coming nearest to Apostolical practice. I do not deny that I do now think much more is to be said for the Apostolical institution of Episcopacy, than I at that time apprehended.*" In apologizing for the mistakes of the work in question he admits "the scepticalness and injudiciousness of youth, and the prejudices of education," under which it was written. This, be it remembered was written *twenty six* years after he wrote his Irenicon, the whole context of which goes to prove the necessity of a National Church Government and the sin of dissenting from it, and so able was his defence of the Established Church on this and other occasions that he was subsequently raised to the Episcopate.

In the preface to the *Unreasonableness of Separation*, a most searching and unanswerable treatise, when speaking of the Nonconformists, among whom he would have classed every Methodist in this Province, he says: "God forbid that I should judge any one among them, as to their present sincerity, or final condition; to their own Master they must stand or fall. But my business was to consider the nature and tendency of their actions. My judgment being that *a causeless breaking the peace of the Church we live in, is really as great and dangerous a sin as murder, and in some respects aggravated beyond it.*" In the body of

the treatise itself, he contends that "*the holding of separate congregations for worship, where there is an agreement in doctrine, and the substantials of religion, is unlawful and schismatical.*" In another place he thus states the question of separation: "According to the Scripture there can be no way left to justify the separation from our Church, but to prove, either that our worship is idolatrous, or that our doctrine is false, or that our ceremonies are made necessary to salvation; which are all so remote from any colour of truth, that none of my adversaries have yet had the hardiness to undertake it." And he thus concludes: "I cannot but declare to the world, as one that believes a day of judgment to come, that upon the most diligent search and careful inquiry I could make into this matter, I cannot find any plea sufficient to justify, in point of conscience, the present separation from the Church of England."

So much for Bishop Stillingfleet, and yet the Methodists never cease from quoting the stripling of twenty five, who also condemns them if they gave correct extracts, whilst they cast into the shade the full grown man, the man of riper age and greater accumulation of theological learning.

Dr. Adam Clarke in his Commentary on the New Testament, says: "Episcopacy in the Church of God is of Divine Appointment, and should be maintained and respected."—Again: "*Deacon, Presbyter and Bishop*, existed in the *Apostolic Church;* and may therefore be considered of *Divine origin.*" 1 Tim.

Again; "In reviewing the whole of this epistle, (1 Tim.) I cannot help considering it of the first consequence to the Church of God. In it, we see more clearly than elsewhere, what the *Ministers* of the gospel should be; and what is the character of the *true Church. Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons*, are particularly described; and their qualifications so circumstantially detailed, that it is impossible to be ignorant on this head."

Mr. Ryerson, the late head of the Methodist Society in Canada, in the "Christian Guardian," of 1842, makes very strong admissions in favor of Episcopacy. He says: "The Editor of the Church has undoubtedly strong ground in favor of Episcopal government—arising from its universality, its reasonableness, its efficacy, its importance in promoting Church union—"

Did space permit, I could give full and satisfactory extracts from almost all the leading Reformers of the Presbyterian body in support of Episcopacy, as established in the Church of England, which they would gladly have adopted had they had any choice upon the subject; but they were compelled by necessity to adopt their present form of Church government.

Calvin, in his Institutes edited at Geneva, A. D. 1590, book IV, chap. XV, tells us in the most distinct terms that the power of ordination was possessed by the Bishops alone in which they were assisted by the Presbyters; which is precisely in accordance with the practice of the Church of England. In this opinion he is supported by Adam Clarke, who says: "it most evidently appears from this verse, (1 Tim. IV: 14) and that above quoted, (2 Tim. I: 6.) that he (Timothy) received this *double imposition;* not probably at *different* times, but *on one and the same occasion:*" "by the imposition of *St. Paul's hands* and by that of the *Presbytery or Eldership.*" Thus we of the Church of England follow not only the example of St. Paul himself who laid his hands on Timothy in which he was assisted by the Presbytery; but also of the Church of Christ for 1500 years.

Again, Calvin in writing to Cardinal Sadolet says: "We do not deny that the discipline, which the ancient Church had, is wanting to us." "Episcopacy," he continues, "proceeded from God." And in his letter to Archbishop Parker, after describing Bishops, such as they ought to be, he says, "If there be any who do not behave themselves with reverence and obedience towards them, there is no anathema but I confess them worthy of it."

Indeed, so deeply sensible was Calvin of the Divine right of Episcopacy, that he, Bullinger and others, in a letter to Edward VI, offered to make him their defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches, as there were in England; with a tender of their service to assist and unite together; which letter was interrupted by Gardiner and Bonner, two popish Bishops, who answered it in the name of the Reformed Bishops, and checked him and slighted his proposals; whereby Calvin's overture perished: from which time John Calvin and the English Church were at variance in several points; which otherwise, through God's mercy, had never been the case, had his proposals been discovered to Elizabeth during his life. But not being discovered until about the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, she lamented that they were not found sooner; which she expressed before her Council at the same time in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sydney and Sir William Cecil.' Stripe's life of Parker, page 70, and also his Memorials of Cranmer, page 207.

Beza, speaking of the Bishops of the Church of England, says: "Let her enjoy this singular bounty of God, which I wish she may hold for ever."

Even Baxter, wished not "to pull up the hedges and lay all waste, but only desired the Prelates' tyranny," as he called it, "might cease." Mackintosh informs us, that he was made Chaplain to the King at the Restoration, and was offered the see of Hereford, which

he declined, not because he thought it unlawful, but because it might engage him in severities against the conscientious; whilst that eminent divine, Dr. Reynolds, "the pride and glory of the Presbyterians," accepted the see of Norwich, with the concurrence of Baxter, and adorned it by his fervent piety, "his extraordinary parts," and the affluence of his exhaustless theological learning." And even Milton, not the warmest friend of Episcopacy, declared "We grant them Bishops—we grant them worthy men—*we grant them placed in several Churches by the Apostles*,—we grant that Irenæcus and Tertullian affirm this."

Melancthon in his immortal work, the Defence of the Augsburg Confession, expresses himself much in the style of Calvin, and after condemning the tyranny exercised by the Romish Bishops, speaks thus:

"Here again, we wish to testify that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical polity, if only the Bishops would cease to rage against our Churches. This our will shall excuse us before God and before all nations to all posterity, lest they should impute it to us that the authority of the Bishops is undermined, when men shall hear and read, that we deprecated the unjust cruelty of our Bishops and could obtain no equity at their hands." He here means the Romish Bishops.

The celebrated John LeClerc, a minister of the Dutch Church, which is modelled after the Presbyterian form, says:

"It is asked among Christians which form of Church government is from the Apostles, for that seems to be preferred before others which was constituted at the beginning, and of two Churches, in which otherwise the gospel is taught with truth and purity, that church is to be chosen in which the Apostolic form of government exists; although government without the thing, that is, government without the gospel, is but the empty image of the Church."

"But now there are two forms of Church government, of which the one is that where the Church acts under a single Bishop, who alone has the right of ordaining Presbyters, and the other inferior orders of evangelical ministers; and the other, where the Church is governed by equal Presbyters, to whom are joined from the people certain men of some prudence and irreproachable conduct. Those who have read without prejudice the remains of the most ancient Christian writers, know well that the first form of discipline, which is called Episcopal, such as we see in the southern part of Great Britain, was everywhere established in the very next age after the Apostles; from whence it is reasonable to conclude that it was of apostolic constitution. But the other which they call Presbyterian, was instituted in many parts of France, Switzerland, Germany and Holland, by those who in the sixteenth century seceded from the Church of Rome."

"Those who have read attentively the history of that age," continues this writer, "know perfectly well that this latter form of Church government was introduced only because the (Romish) Bishops refused to grant any reformation in those points of christian doctrine and manners which were complained of as being corruptions. For otherwise, if the Bishops of that day had been willing to do every where, that which was shortly afterwards done in England, that same Church government would have obtained at this day among all who seceded from the Church of Rome, and thus innumerable calamities which have happened from the confusions and convulsions of ecclesiastical affairs, might have been avoided." And further on he says that whoever has read the writings of that most eminent man, Hugo Grotius, knows that "he vehemently applauded the Episcopal form of Government such as obtains in England;" because when he had studiously examined the writings of Christian antiquity, he found it to be "the primeval form." John Clerc—Append, ad lib. Hug. Grotius de veritat. relig. Christi. Ed., Boston, A. D., 1809, p. 362.

Having now presented to you the opinion of Calvin who honestly praised the Episcopal form, together with that of others, and also that of the Lutheran branch of the Reformation, through their great organ, Melancthon, with Le Clerc and Hugo Grotius, the most learned of their age, and brought up in the tenets of the Presbyterian Church of Holland, I shall conclude with the words of an eminent divine of our sister Church, Bishop De Lancy:

"When we look over the Christian world, elevating our view above and beyond the narrow sphere which lies immediately around us, and extending it to the widest circuit, we see evidence enough to justify the assertion that the sun above us does not shine upon a solitary portion of christendom where this office (of Bishop) and this officer are unknown. From every kindred and people and nation and tongue, that has bowed the knee to the gospel of Christ, there comes the testimony to the knowledge of its claims as part of the gospel system, with unvarying uniformity in its behalf. Call these national witnesses from any quarter of the globe that pleases you. Let them come from civilized and enlightened Europe, from the sad remnants of the christian faith in Africa,* from the in-

* "Certain it is, that, soon after the conversion of the Eunuch, the Christian religion spread so far throughout Ethiopia that Bishops from that country attended councils held at Alexandria." "The Christians of Egypt

most recesses of Asia,† or from our own shores, the attestation is, that there is no one section of these divisions of the world, on which the gospel now shines, whether in the full brilliancy of truth, or obscured and dimmed by superstition and error, where the name and nature of this office of a Bishop in the Christian Church can be said to be wholly unknown."

CHAPTER IX.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

The Apostolical Succession, I rejoice to say, is a doctrine that is widely regaining its once undisputed influence throughout the Christian world and every where thinning the ranks of Dissent; since almost every honest dissenter from the Church, who investigates the subject minutely, is compelled to acknowledge its existence in various parts of the world. One of the greatest difficulties presented to the reception of this doctrine is, that men, with confused ideas of Protestantism and Popery in their heads, will not draw the proper distinction between that which is Catholic and that which is Roman Catholic.—They stamp the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as a fable, simply on the ground of its coming through the corrupt channel of the Romish Church, and yet, strange to say, they receive the Scriptures as the word of truth, which have been transmitted to us through the same channel. Regardless of the length to which such conclusions lead, the enemies of our Church hesitate not to brand as Popish every thing which they themselves have not the good fortune to enjoy, and by thus prejudicing the minds of their adherents they gain a temporary advantage over the cause of truth. But men will not be always so blinded. A spirit of enquiry is abroad, and thousands are asking for "the old paths," who, until of late, felt quite at ease under the teaching of self constituted guides. They are no longer to be deterred from enquiry on the worn out, hackneyed cry of Popery. We are opposed to Romanism as much as others, and while the Homily for Whitsunday, part second, (even were there nothing more) is retained in our Church, there need be nothing feared by the members of her communion. To return to the question of apostolic succession: As I have already stated, the brand of Popery is set upon this doctrine; and it is maintained that because it comes through a vitiated channel, therefore it must be false. Does gold, I would ask, lose any of its value by passing through soiled hands? Are the acts performed in the exercise of lawful and established authority, less valid, or rendered null, by reason of any stain upon the character of the person who performs them? Is a King's commission rendered void in consequence of the unworthiness of the individual on whom it is bestowed? And why should God's commission? was the promised seed of salvation, the blessed Jesus, tainted or destroyed by passing through the meretricious womb of Rahab, and the incestuous womb of Thamar? And if not, is it reasonable to suppose that the spiritual seed for the ministration of that salvation has suffered injury by its transmission through a vitiated channel? Certainly not. How then can the unworthiness of the Bishops of Rome interfere with the subject of Apostolical Succession? I can easily understand the uneasiness which modern Methodists feel under the teaching of this doctrine. They know full well it strikes at the root of their cherished system, and they are not ignorant of the fact that the pillar and ground of Methodism, Bishop Stillingfleet, rises in judgment against them. Hear him:

"The universal consent of the Church being proved, there is as great reason to believe the Apostolical Succession to be of divine institution, as the canon of Scripture or the observation of the Lord's day. We do not doubt but it is unlawful to add to or to diminish from the canon of Scripture, and yet there is no plain text for it, with respect to all the books contained in it; and some of the books were a long time disputed in some Churches; but the Churches coming at last to a full agreement in this matter, upon due search and enquiry, hath been thought sufficient to bind all after ages to make no alterations in it.—And as to the Divine institution of the Lord's day, we do not go about to lessen it, but only to show that some examples in Scripture being joined with the universal practice of

---

are at this day distinguished by this name, (The Copti) and speak a language peculiar to themselves, which they call Copti." "These Copti have a Patriarch, who generally resides at Alexandria or Cairo; and under him are eleven Bishops, who, all exercise the Episcopal authority in their own Dioceses." Hurd on Religions.

† Add to this the testimony of the Nestorian Bishop, Mar Yohanan, from the interior of Asia, the discoveries of Buchanan in Hindoston and the testimony of Dr. Grant; and adequate ground is efforded for the above assertion.

the Church, in its purest ages, hath been allowed to be sufficient ground, not only for following ages to observe it, but to look on it as at least an apostolical institution. Now it cannot but seem unequal not to allow the same force, where there is the same evidence.—And therefore our Church hath wisely and truly determined, that since 'the Apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons; and in a regular well constituted Church are to continue till the world's end."—From Ordination Sermon, preached 1685, twenty six years after he wrote the Irenicon; and yet Bishop Stillingfleet is made to admit that "the office of a Bishop, as held in the Church of England, has no foundation in the oracles of God"!!

Here, as you will perceive, the Methodists are condemned by their own familiar friend, who boldly pronounces them in error.

This doctrine of Apostolical Succession and its consequence—the Divine right of Episcopacy have always been taught in the Church of England, but that it should give such mortal offence to the followers of Wesley is very natural, as he has in positive terms denied its existence; his words are these: "The uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove. But this does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England; from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago. I still attend all the ordinances of the Church, at all opportunities. And I constantly and earnestly desire all that are connected with me so to do." Vol. XIII, p. 220 A. D. 1785. The first part of this extract is used on all occasions by the Methodists, although I am at a loss to know with what fairness they can separate it from its context; which urges an unflinching adherence to the Church of England, and yet they always do so; and this is the style of every extract used by that body. They take just what answers their purpose without the slightest reference to the meaning of the context, which in every instance would condemn them. The Bible itself, although stamped with the seal of high Divinity, would not bear such treatment. I will instance one verse, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." Take the first clause of this sentence away and use the second: "How readest thou?" "There is no God!" What, do you deny the existence of a Deity? Horrible! Blasphemous!! and yet you are not in as bad a situation as Mr. Wesley has left his followers; for "They have left the Church of England and God has left them."

But the most remarkable feature in this particular is, that while *individual* Preachers, where they think it will injure the Church of England, repudiate the Succession as a *fable*; the whole *congregated body* in Conference, in their annual Address in 1845, pronounced it "*Scriptural and necessary.*" Let them speak for themselves:

"The number of members is less than last year, owing to the exercise of discipline, and other causes; but we apprehend that a diminution in this respect has been attended with a personal scrutiny, a self dedication, and a consolidation among our people of considerable spiritual advantage to them; and that future accessions may be largely and confidently anticipated. One ground of anticipation is the unusually large number of Probationers for the ministry cordially and publicly received into the Conference, and ordained since we assembled, and likewise the large number of brethren who have been received on Trial for the Itinerancy. Thus there is a *Succession* which we believe to be *Scriptural and necessary* for our rising country, and which strengthens the expectation we have of the perpetuity of the Wesleyan Ministry."

Is not this astounding? Was there ever such a compound of contradiction as modern Methodism. Benjamin Nankeville tells us in Carleton Place, in 1849, that Apostolic Succession is a fable, (page 39), and the very identical Benjamin Nankeville, with his brethren in Conference, tells us at St. Catharines in 1845, that it is "*scriptural and necessary.*" And here I would say: If it is *scriptural*, it must be be *apostolical*, and if it is *necessary*, there cannot exist a Church of God without it; consequently as Methodism has it not, it cannot be a Church of God.

The truth lies here: They know that it is *Scriptural* and they see that it is *necessary*: they know at the same time that they can lay no claim to it. What then is to be done to keep their disorganised body together? The spirit of enquiry is abroad, and men are seeking "the old paths." What is to be done? Their system is not sufficiently developed to pawn upon its members the possession of this "*Scriptural and Necessary*" doctrine; a few *feelers* must therefore be thrown out to see how it will be received, and then, they will insert it in their Book of Discipline with as much unblushing effrontery, as though they had a legitimate right to it. Witness the alleged ordination of Dr. Coke—the letters of orders, &c., and say they will stop there! No; before long this also will be added to the number!!

In connexion with this subject I will give a remarkable document "on the subject of a union between the English and Canada Conferences," in 1832.

Resolved—"3. That Episcopacy be susperseded by an Annual Presidency; unless it will jeopard our Church property, or as soon as it can be legally secured." Page 50.

Here you see they held Episcopacy up to the year 1832, and maintained it with a violence only equalled by their opposition to it in 1849. And mark: Although they regard it as unscriptural and popish, they are still to retain it, if the rejection of it would "*jeopard their Church property.*" So, "for filthy lucre's sake" they are prepared to adopt any course.—Verily, the words of Wesley are fulfilled: "The Methodists have left the Church of England, and God has left them."

I shall conclude the subject of this *Scriptural and Necessary doctrine*, with the following extracts;—

CHAPTER X.

TESTIMONIES IN FAVOR OF THE FOREGOING.

Dr. Adam Clarke. "The doctrines of the Church of England I most conscientiously acknowledge, as constituting the true Christian creed. I never had anything to unlearn, when, with a heart open to conviction, I read in parallel the New Testament and the Liturgy of the Church."

Mr. R. Watson on Matt. XXVIII: 20. "Always—that is daily, or constantly, *without interruption*, unto the end of the world—unto the consummation of all things: which shows that the Ministry was to be perpetuated throughout all time; and that the words of Christ in these verses were not addressed to the Apostles only, but to their *Successors throughout all future ages.*"

Mr. George Scott, a Wesleyan Preacher, lately travelling in this Province to obtain relief for the promotion of religion in Sweden, contends that in that country "The Episcopal Succession, as that form is ecclesiastically understood, is as clear and decided, as in any part of the world."

Dr. Grant, an American Missionary, and a Presbyterian, in his work on "the Nestorians or the Lost Tribes," quotes with approbation from Assemani, the following passage:

"It seems sufficiently demonstrated that Christians, laymen, Deacons, Priests, and Bishops, have always been in Persia, from the apostolic times and forward *in an uninterrupted succession.*"

Again. "There has been a regular, uninterrupted succession of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and churches, from the apostolic times to the present day." Add to this the testimony of the Nestorian Bishop, Mar Yohanan (lately brought to this continent from the interior of Asia under the auspices of a Presbyterian Missionary,) in his address at Grace Church, Boston, February 27, 1842.

"Our Church is from the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I am happy to find it like your Church. We have Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Our Prayer Books are like your Prayer Books. We have the communion of bread and wine as you do. We have baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. We keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week. We keep Christmas on the same day as you. We keep the forty days of Lent. We keep the day when Christ was crucified; the day when he rose from the dead; the day of his ascension into heaven. We believe in Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three persons and one God as your Church. We teach repentance and forgiveness of sins by Jesus Christ, who takes away the sins of the world."

This coming from a Church that never had the slightest connexion with Rome, that never even heard the names of Cranmer, Luther, Calvin, until visited by Missionaries, is important.

On the subject of confirmation he is equally satisfactory. Witness the following conversation:

"Have you the rite of Confirmation, and whence do you derive it? Mar Yoh. 'Yes, always; it came from the Apostles.' Who administers it? 'I do; the Bishops do it.'—When? 'Just before young people come to communion the first time, I lay my hands on the head and bless them, and pray over them.' We then recited the sentence of our own Bishops in Confirmation. 'Yes, yes, I hear that in one of your churches, it is like our own.'

We are told that "Dr. Buchanan in his Christian Researches informs us,"—

"That the Syrian Christians, having preserved the simplicity of the primitive times, have only two orders in their churches, the bishop and deacon."

I cannot find such an expression within the covers of that book. The opposite I can find in every page relative to that Church; let it speak for itself:

"When the Portuguese arrived, they were agreeably surprised to find upwards of a hundred christian churches on the coast of Malabar. But when they became acquainted with the purity and simplicity of their worship, they were offended. These churches, said the Portuguese, belong to the Pope. Who is the Pope? said the natives; we never heard of him. The European Priests were still more alarmed when they found that these Hindoo christians maintained the order and discipline of a regular church under Episcopal jurisdiction; and that for three hundred years past, they had enjoyed a succession of Bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. We, said they, are of the true faith, whatever you from the West may be; for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called christians." Page 74.

The Portuguese having obtained sufficient strength invaded these tranquil churches, and seizing the Syrian Bishop, Mar Joseph, sent him prisoner to Lisbon. They then convened a synod at which one hundred and fifty of the Syrian Clergy appeared; who were accused of the following practices and opinions: "That they had married wives—that they owned but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; that they neither invoked saints, nor worshipped images, nor believed in Purgatory; and that they had no other orders or names of dignity in the Church, than Bishop, Priest and Deacon." *Ib.*

Buchanan proceeds to tell us that for two centuries the churches in the interior, that had not submitted to Rome, had been altogether lost sight of, and as many doubted whether they existed at all, he conceived the design of visiting them. His search, happily, was not in vain, as he found them in all their original simplicity and purity; their Ministry being composed, as it always had been of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. On one occasion he tells us he was received at the door of the church by three Presbyters habited in white vestments and with them were two Deacons. On another occasion he visited "Mar Diomysius, the Metropolitan of Malabar," and the subject turning upon Protestant Episcopacy, he observes,—

"The Bishop was desirous to know something of the other churches which had separated from Rome. I was ashamed to tell him how many there were. I mentioned that there was a Presbyter Church in our Kingdom in which every Presbyter was equal to another. 'Are there no Deacons in Holy Orders?' None. 'And what! is there nobody to overlook the Presbyters?' Not one. There must be something imperfect there," said he.—Page 80.

Let this suffice to show that Episcopacy as held in our church is held in the Syrian churches, and that they have never been without the three orders, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. From whence, then, did Mr. Nankeville get his information? I trust he will inform us and produce the original.

Produce the original, did I say? That I fear he will not be willing to do,—since the plain, straightforward statement of Dr. Buchanan is at utter variance with the tortuous windings, and twisting perversions of this redoubted champion of Modern Methodism, and clearly proves him to be rather a dealer in fable, than a lover of truth.

We shall now examine the few passages brought forward from the New Testament in proof of Presbyterian ordination.

Mr. Nankeville, to prove Bishops and Presbyters the same order, says: "In the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where we have an account of St. Paul's solemn charge delivered to the elders of the church of Ephesus, met together at Miletus, they are all denominated by him, *bishops or overseers.*"

The fact of St. Paul delivering this *solemn charge* to the elders of the church of Ephesus shows that he himself exercised an authority superior to those whom he addressed.—If we deny the existence of a *superior order because it is not mentioned*, we may, by the same mode of argument, deny that of *Deacon*, since it is *not mentioned either*. The Prophets Hosea, Joel, Micah, Zephaniah and Haggai, mention Priests only; will any one on that account say, that, in their days there were neither High Priests nor Levites?

Again: "St. Paul, in writing to the church at Philippi, mentions *only bishops and deacons.* Now if there was another order distinct from that of bishops and deacons, how comes it to pass that there is not the least notice taken of it?"

St. Paul's addressing a pastoral letter to the bishops and deacons of the Philippian church proves the existence of a *third* order superior to either of those addressed.

"The Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, uniformly designate the Jewish ministry as Priests and Levites, with no allusion to any other office; and a man might as well argue, that therefore at that time, there was no superior office, no high priesthood among the Jews, as that there was no superior office, no chief episcopate, among the christians when St. Paul wrote." Perceval.

Lastly. The case of Titus who was left in Crete that *he* "should ordain elders in every city;" which incontrovertibly proves that the office of elder was subordinate to that which he exercised. Thus you see that these passages stamp with the seal of truth the *Threefold* ministry of the Church of Christ, as established in the Church of England.

In page 25th of the "Vindication," we are told "there are *only three orders*" "in the Church of England;" and in page 43 we are informed that, "In the Church of England there are the different orders of Rector, Dean, Archdeacon, Archbishop and Primate;" making in all *five*.

The greater part of the "Vindication" goes to prove that Bishops and Presbyters are the *same*, but in page 26 we are informed that Dr. Coke was ordained, "not as a Sabbath School Superintendent, nor as a Presbyter, (for he was one before) but as a Bishop," thereby showing them to be *different*. Wonderful Vindication! how clear and lucid are thy self-contradicting statements!! what wonders hast thou wrought!!!

We should be careful not to confound *orders* and *office*. Thus, in the Church of England there are but *three orders:* Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. Orders means those appointments conferred by ordination; whereas there are *several offices* which are merely different *grades* in these *orders:* for instance an Archbishop is only *equal* to his brother Bishops in *order*, although *superior* to them in *office*, being their chairman, &c. An Archdeacon is only a *Presbyter in order*, although *superior* to him in *office*.

CHAPTER XI.

BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS NOT THE SAME ORDER.

Having satisfactorily shown from the Methodist "Book of Discipline," &c., that Bishops and Presbyters are *different* orders, I shall now consider the few of Mr. Nankeville's assertions on this head, which are worthy of a remark. He says:

"Bishop Burnett observes,": "Another thing is that both in this writing and the "Necessary Erudition of a christian Man," bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office;" from which the Author of the "Vindication" concludes: "No determinations in the Church of England can have higher authority;" and lastly, he mentions the case of Archbishop Grindal's licensing one John Morrison to officiate in Scotland, without having undergone a re-ordination; he having been previously ordained only by Presbyters.

To put the views of Bishop Burnett beyond all doubt I shall give the *whole extract*, and then you will be able to form a correct idea of his sentiments. "Another thing is, that both in this writing (a document signed by Archbishop Cranmer and several other bishops, &c.,) and in the Necessary Erudition of a christian man, bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office. In the ancient church they knew none of these subtilties which were found out in the latter ages. It was then thought enough that a bishop was to be dedicated to his function by a new imposition of hands, and that several offices would not be performed without bishops, such as ordination, confirmation &c.; but they did not refine in these matters so much as to enquire whether bishops and priests differed in order and office, or only in degree. But after the schoolmen fell to examine matters of divinity with logical and unintelligible niceties, and the canonists began to comment upon the rules of the ancient church, they studied to make bishops and priests seem very near one another, so that the difference was but small. They did it with different designs; the schoolmen having set up the grand mystery of transubstantiation, were to exalt the priestly office as much as was possible; for the turning the host into God was so great an action, that they reckoned there could be no office higher than that which qualified a man to so mighty a performance; therefore as they changed the form of ordination from what it was anciently believed to consist in, to a delivering of the sacred vessels, and held that a priest had his orders by that rite; and not by the imposition of hands; so they raised their order or office so high, as to make it equal with the order of bishop; but as they designed to extol the order of priesthood, so the canonists had as great a mind to depress the episcopal order. They generally wrote for preferment and the way to it was to exalt the papacy. Nothing could do that so effectually as to bring down the power of Bishops. This only could justify the exemptions of the monks and friars, the Popes setting up legantine courts, and receiving at first appeals and then original causes before them; together with many other encroachments on their jurisdiction; all which were unlawful, if the bishops had, by divine right, jurisdiction in their dioceses; therefore it was necessary to lay them as low as could be, and to make them think that the power they held was rather as delegates of the apostolic see, than by a commission from Christ or his apostles; so that they looked on the declaring episcopal authority to be of divine right, as a blow that would be

fatal to the court of Rome; and therefore they did after this, at Trent, use all possible endeavours to hinder any such decision. It having been then the common style of that age to reckon bishops and priests as the same office, it is no wonder if at this time the clergy of this church, the greatest part of them being still leavened with the old superstition, and the rest of them not having enough of spare time to examine lesser matters, retained still the former phrases in this particular.

On this, I have insisted the more, that it may appear how little they have considered things, who are so far carried with their zeal against the established government of this church, as to make much use of some passages of the Schoolmen and Canonists that deny them to be distinct offices, for these are the very dregs of Popery; the one raising the priests higher for the sake of transubstantiation, the other pulling the bishops lower for the sake of the Pope's supremacy, and by such means bringing them almost to an equallity. So partial are some men to their particular conceits, that they make use of the most mischievous topics when they can serve their turn, not considering how much further these arguments will run if they ever admits them." Burnett on the Reform: Addenda, Vol. I.

Thus you perceive had the extracts been given in full, it would have operated unfavorably and defeated the cause Mr. N. desired to serve. In it we have the reason assigned why bishops and priests were spoken of as one and the same. The schoolmen did it to exalt the priestly office as high as possible, in the eyes of the world, to impose upon the ignorant and unthinking, by persuading them that no office could be higher than that which had the power of making God, as they impiously termed the act of transubstantiation in which they pretend to change the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ. The canonists, on the other hand wished to lower the episcopal order, because as they wrote for preferment, their great object was to exalt the papacy. Besides this, the greater part of the clergy were still leavened with the old superstition; moreover, not having any spare time to examine lesser matters, it is no wonder that they retained the former phrases in this particular, although they were the very dregs of Popery. And so partial are some men in their particular conceits, that, even at this day (how like Mr. N.) they make use of the most mischievous topics to serve their turn: although they are aware that there never was a time in the Romish Church when bishops and priests were regarded as the same order. So much for Burnett, and yet he is brought forward on another occasion as favouring the notion.

I shall conclude the examination of this point by another extract which will bring conviction to any mind.

"It must be borne in mind that *all* the Reformers of the English Church had been educated in the Romish faith. A complete change of sentiment could not be wrought in a day or a year. This change must be gradual; unless, as often hapens, it goes from one extreme to the other. But such was not the case with the English Reformers, and evidence of their progress appears in the productions of the various epochs of the Reformation. From this it will be seen, that the *date* of a document cited as evidence on this head, is most material. If a given document contains the opinion of Cranmer and others who were *afterwards* Reformers, while they were Romanists, then to quote *that* as evidence of what the *Reformers* thought is gross misrepresentation.

"To show how these various documents came to be produced, and that our readers may see how far they are pertinent to prove the opinions of the *Reformers*, we shall allude to the *manner* in which the English Church was reformed. The first distinguishing feature of the English Reformation is, that *it was the calm, dispassionate and deliberate act of the most pious and learned among the clergy*, approved by the great body of the laity, while in other countries it was usually the act of some rash and headstrong individual, *opposed* to the body of the clergy. The second is the *mode* in which they conducted their efforts for reformation. This we cannot better state than in the language of a historian of those days. He says: "First, the whole business they were to consider was divided into so many heads, which were proposed as queries, and these were given out to the Bishops and divines; and at a prefixed time, every one brought in his opinion in writing on all the questions."—Burnett, vol. I, p. 372.

In this manner all questions relating either to faith or practice, were examined. When these opinions had been handed in, the authors met and conferred upon their points of difference, until they were able to agree upon something to be laid before the convocation, to be approved by that body. One of the first of these conferences was held in 1537, or 1538, at which a number of papers were drawn up. Two of these papers have been preserved by Burnett. One of them is entitled, "A Declaration made of the functions and *Divine Institution* of Bishops and Priests."

"*The Institution of a Christian Man* was compiled from these papers,* and published the same year. This book contains the paragraph we have copied from the foregoing "de-

* Strype Ann. B. I. c. 41. p. 315.

claration," and is one of the authorities usually cited by Anti-Churchmen. With how much fairness it can be thus quoted, our readers can judge, when we tell them, that this book, compiled from these documents, and signed by Cranmer and thirty six of the most learned of the Clergy, established the Romish doctrine of "Transubstantiation, communion in one kind,† celibacy of the clergy, auricular confession, seven sacraments and purgatory." In all these things they proved themselves staunch Papists, save in the single item of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and perhaps the subject of monastic vows. This, therefore, was the opinion of these men as Romanists, not as Reformers, and the man who quotes them as such, is either too ignorant to write or too dishonest to be trusted." Rev. A. B. Chapin, M. A.

From what has been shown you will perceive that Cranmer and those connected with him were Romanists at that time, and that their opinion was delivered in the first dawn of the Reformation, before they had had time or opportunity to examine the question. How different was the sentiment of that good man when the night of superstition had passed away and the morning of the Reformation had shone upon his soul;—how differently did he express himself *subsequently* in his sermon on the power of the Keys when his mind was divested of the errors of Rome; and this as his later and more deliberate statement of doctrine on this point, must be fairly taken as his real conviction.

"*The ministration of God's word*, which our Lord Jesus Christ himself at first did institute, *was derived from the Apostles unto others after them, by imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles' time to our days.* And this was the consecration, orders and unction of the Apostles, whereby they at the beginning made Bishops and Priests, and this shall continue in the Church *even to the world's end.*"

I will conclude this point by an extract from the Prayer Book. "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostle's time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests and Deacons—and therefore to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the united Church of England and Ireland, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, in the united Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except to be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."

Such was the language of the Church in 1549, when Cranmer was Primate, and such is its rule and practice at this day.

CHAPTER XII.

THE NECESSARY ERUDITION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN.

This book was merely a revision of the "Institution" already referred to, revised and corrected by the King; hence it was called "The King's Book," or, in other words, "Henry's Mass Book." It taught in common with the "Institution," that Bishops and Priests were the same order, and this is the last we hear of that opinion, although it is declared of this and that which we have just examined, '*no determinations in the Church of England can have higher authority.*' Let us try the weight of this assertion.

This Book was published five years before the death of Henry VIII, and seven years before the compilation of the Prayer Book, and taught 'Transubstantiation, sacrament in one kind, oil in baptism, extreme unction, prayers for the dead.' Now if its testimony is worth anything on one point, surely it is worth as much on another. What then does this prove? It proves conclusively that the Church of England was *not reformed*,—that it was still incrusted with *Roman Catholic* errors; and yet we are told, 'No determinations in the Church of England can have higher authority.' This is too absurd and would never be broached by any one whose heart did not incline to the errors of Romanism.

CHAPTER XIII.

LICENSING OF JOHN MORRISON.

With regard to the case of John Morrison, already referred to, I need only say that Archbishop Grindal for this very act and other irregularities was suspended. Strype's life of Grindal.

† Strype and Burnett.

We are referred to the Bishop of London, who for aught that is said to the contrary, might have been a Methodist Preacher, as some Teachers of that denomination (Benjamin Nankeville, James Sykes and others) arrogate to themselves the title of Bishops; to a Dr. Robertson, Dr. Cox, &c., to whose assertions, even supposing them to be correctly given, by Mr. N., we can attach no importance, unless we know whence they are derived; we may therefore pass them by without further notice.

CHAPTER XIV.

A CHARGE OF FALSEHOOD.

Mr. Nankeville undertakes to prove me guilty of falsehood for attributing an expression to Mr. Wesley, which, he says, he *never uttered;* and charges me with "doing his memory the *greatest injury* by making him say, that" "If the Methodists leave the Church, God would leave them."

Hear Mr. Wesley, and then judge who has told the falsehood, and lest I might be charged with giving a detached passage, I shall quote the whole letter.

TO MR. SAMUEL BARDSLEY.

BIRMINGHAM, March 25, 1787.

"*Dear Sammy:* You send me good news concerning the progress of the work of God in Colne circuit. I should think brother Jackson or Sagar might set the heads of the people at Bacup right. Brother Jackson should advise brother Ridell, not to please the devil by preaching himself to death I still think, when the Methodists leave the Church of England, God will leave them. Every year more and more of the Clergy are convinced of the truth and grow well affected towards us. It would be contrary to all common sense, as well as to good conscience, to make a separation now.

Vol XII, p. 488. "I am, dear Sammy, your affectionate brother,

JOHN WESLEY."

Thus you see that the opinion which Mr. Wesley entertained in early life, he entertained in old age. *I still think:* such were my sentiments before and such are they now.—What think you of that? Have *I* injured the memory of Mr. Wesley? No; but his pretended followers do, by falsifying him, who never changed in this particular.

A word more on this head.

In the "Tract," usually denominated "The Large Minutes," which "contains the plan of discipline as practised in the Methodist Connexion during the life of Mr. Wesley," we have the following question:

"Q. 41. How should an Assistant be qualified for his charge?

"A. By walking closely with God, and having his work greatly at heart; by understanding and loving discipline, ours in particular; and by loving the Church of England, and resolving not to separate from it. Let this be well observed. I fear when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." Vol. VIII, p. 319.

"These Minutes were last revised in 1789," and are "reprinted from a copy which bears the date of 1791—the year in which Mr. Wesley died,—collated with the edition of 1789." We have here the necessary qualifications for an Assistant before he was suffered to enter upon his charge; and that you may the better understand who is meant by an Assistant, I will give you the foregoing question.

"Q. 40. Who is the Assistant?

"A. That Preacher in each Circuit who is appointed, from time to time, to take charge of the societies and the other Preachers therein."

Is that man qualified to be an Assistant, who neither *walks closely with God—loves the Church of England—nor speaks the truth?* I trust to be favoured with an answer to this question.

That you may more fully understand this matter, I will give you another question from these Minutes.

"Q. 51. What method may we use in receiving a new Helper?

"A. Every person proposed is then to be present; and each of them may be asked: Do you constantly attend the Church and sacrament? Have you read the "Minutes of the Conference?" Are you willing to conform to them?" "When he has been on trial four years, if recommended by the Assistant, he may be received into full connexion, by giving him the "Minutes" inscribed thus: "As long as you freely consent to, and earnestly endeavor to walk by these Rules, we shall rejoice to acknowledge you as a fellow labourer." Thus you see that no Preacher could plead ignorance of his duty, as the Minutes were not only given to him, but he was asked, had he read them, and was he willing to conform to them? Vol. VIII, p. 325.

CHAPTER XV.

WESLEY NOT A DISSENTER, &C.

We are told "That the Rev. John Wesley, and all in connexion with him were dissenters from the Church of England, and proved to be so by Mr. Wesley's conduct, by the Canons of the Church, and by the Act of Toleration;" and that through his being a Dissenter, "thousands will have to praise God to all eternity."*

These assertions I will set at nought by giving two Questions from the foregoing Minutes, and leave Mr. Wesley (who understood the Canons of the Church, and "The Act of Toleration" quite as well as any of his followers) to decide the matter.

"Q. 44. Are there any other advices which you would give the Assistants?

"A. Several—— (9) Exhort all that were brought up in the Church, to continue therein. Set the example yourself; and immediately change every plan that would hinder their being at church at least two Sundays in four. Carefully avoid whatever has a tendency to separate men from the Church; and let all the servants in our preaching houses go to church once on Sunday at least.

"Is there not a cause? Are we not unawares, by little and little, sliding into a separation from the Church? O, use every means to prevent this! (1) Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and sacrament. (2) Warn them all against niceness in hearing—a prevailing evil. (3) Warn them also, against despising the Prayers of the Church.—(4) Against calling our society "the Church." (5) Against calling our Preachers, "Ministers;" our Houses, "Meeting-houses;" call them plain preaching houses or chapels. (6) Do not license them as Dissenters. The proper paper to be sent in at the Assizes, Sessions or Bishop's Court, is this: "A. B. has set apart his house in C. for public worship, of which he desires a certificate." N. B. The Justice does not license the house, but the Act of Parliament. (7) Do not license yourself till you are constrained; and then, not as a Dissenter, but a Methodist.

"Q. 45. But are we not Dissenters?

"A. No: Although we call sinners to repentance in all places of God's dominion; and although we frequently use extemporary prayer, and unite together in a religious society; yet we are not Dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges, namely, those who renounce the service of the Church. We do not, we dare not, separate from it. We are not Seceders, we do not bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles—we will keep in the good old way. And never let us make light of going to church, either by word or deed.

"But some may say: "Our own service is public worship." Yes; but not such as supersedes the Church Service; it presupposes public prayer, like the Sermons at the University. If it were designed to be instead of the Church Service, it would be essentially defective; for it seldom has the four grand parts of public prayer, deprecation, petition, intercession and thanksgiving." Vol. VIII, p. 320.

From these words of Mr. Wesley, you will perceive that neither he nor his followers were Dissenters from the Church of England, and consequently that this assertion, like the rest, is not only false, but sinful (to the greatest degree), as it is brought forward in justification of the schismatical position assumed by modern Methodism.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE FORCE OF PREJUDICE.

Mr. Nankeville tells us that while he remained in the Church of England, he, and others, "were hasting to everlasting destruction, until it pleased God to bring them to hear the gospel preached with power, by these men of God, whom the Rev. gentleman despises." I fear, Sir, that in going farther you have sped worse. You do me injustice, good Sir, if you suppose that I despise you. I could not despise one for whom Christ died;—I could not despise one of that family whom the Author of our existence pronounced "*very good*,"—I could not despise the very *meanest* of God's creation;—No Sir, I despise you not, I pity you, I pray for you, and in the beautiful and impressive language of our Liturgy, I 'beseech the Lord to lead into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived.'

How different from Mr. Nankeville's, were the sentiments of the Founder of Method-

---

* Q. Will Benjamin Nankeville be of the number? A. Not unless he repents

ism. In writing to the Rev. Mr. G., whom he "*believes fears God and works righteousness*," Wesley says:

"I quite agree, we "*neither can be better men, nor better Christians, than by continuing members of the Church of England.*" And not only her doctrines, but many parts of her discipline, I have adhered to at the hazard of my life."

This letter is dated, April 2, 1761. Vol. XII, 246.

Again, in writing to Mr. Knox whose "real, scriptural christianity," Mr. Wesley once commended in the highest terms and of whom he says: "*I want nothing, only that you should be happy in time and in eternity*," he gives him the following advice:

"*But you will not leave the Church.*" "You never will by my advice; I advise just the contrary; I advise you to lose no opportunity of attending the service of the Church, and receiving the Lord's supper, and of showing your regard for all her appointments. I advise steadily to adhere to her doctrine *in every branch of it;* particularly with regard to the two fundamental points,—justification by faith and holiness. But above all, I cannot but earnestly entreat you, not to rest until you experience what she teaches; till (to sum up all in one word) God cleanses the thoughts of your heart by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit, that you may perfectly love him and worthily magnify his holy name."

This letter is dated May 30, 1765. Vol. XII, p. 239.

On this head I might quote to any extent, but shall confine myself to "A Letter to The Rev. Mr. Toogood, of Exeter; occasioned by his Dissent from the Church of England."—Vol. X, p. 501.

Mr. Toogood, it would appear, separated from the Church of England, on the plea that it was "a debt he owed to God, and an act of allegiance due to Christ, the only Lawgiver in the Church."

This gentleman in one respect, but I trust in no other, resembled Mr. Nankeville. His conscientious scruples, it would seem, would not suffer him to remain in the Church of England. It was not good enough for him, or, in other words, he was *too good* for it. But what does Mr. Wesley say to all this? After objecting to his conduct, on the plea that the writer was "*not serious*,"—that he "did not write as did those excellent men, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Howe, Dr. Calamy, who seemed always to speak, not laughing, but weeping," he concludes; "But I waive them (other arguments) for the present; hoping this may suffice to show any fair and candid inquirer, that it is very possible to be united to Christ and to the Church of England at the same time; that we need not separate from the Church, in order to preserve our allegiance to Christ; but may be firm members thereof, and yet "have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man."

There is a wide difference here; how can it be accounted for? Mr. Wesley, in writing to those whose happiness *in time and in eternity* he had greatly at heart, recommends them to continue in the Church of England, and "steadily to adhere to her doctrine *in every branch of it*," and "not to rest until they experience what *she* teaches"—holiness in life, the necessary consequence of saving faith. Mr. Nankeville, on the other hand, urges a separation from the Church of England, and even declares that he "*was hasting to everlasting destruction* while he remained in it. How can we reconcile this discrepancy? Let us see:

We are told Mr. Wesley was "*taught of God*," and we learn from himself that he received his teaching in the Church of England. Now judging from the conduct and writings of Mr. Nankeville—he must have preferred other teaching to that of the Founder of Methodism—he must have chosen other instructors than that holy Being, who alone can make wise unto salvation; and the lessons he received have, evidently, not been forgotten.

"Naturam expelles furea tamen usque recurret."

CHAPTER XVII.

PREJUDICED AND UNPREJUDICED ESTIMATION OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

From what I have just said you see the opinion of Mr. Wesley with regard to separation from the church, on the plea of its want of spirituality, and yet we are told that the Methodists cannot return to the church, until "many things in the Liturgy of the church, contrary to the word of God, as in the office of baptism, the visitation of the sick, the rite of confirmation, the burial of the dead, &c., these old relics of Popery, these monuments of idolatry, are removed out of the way."

This I shall answer by adducing the testimony of others, against whom the charge of Popery was never laid by any honest man, and who were as good judges of what constitu-

ted a scriptural Liturgy as any teacher of Modern Methodism, and this I will premise by saying that The Prayer Book was last revised in the year 1661, from which time it has undergone no change.

Bucer: "When I thoroughly understood the Liturgy, I gave thanks to God who had granted to this Church, to reform her rites to that degree of purity."

Saravia: "Among others that have reformed their Churches, I have often admired the wisdom of those who restored the true worship of God to the Church of England; who so tempered themselves, that they cannot be reproved for having departed from the ancient and primitive custom of the Church of God."

The Divines of the Synod of Dort say: "We have a great honor for the good order and discipline of the Church of England, and heartily wish we could establish ourselves upon this model."

Alesius, a Scotch Divine, says: "Let it be seen and read by many for the honor of the English Church,—hope it may provoke the rest of the reformed to imitate this most noble and divine work in settling the Church."

Baxter, (a non-conformist) declared that almost every Church on earth had a worse Liturgy than ours, and furthermore says; "I constantly join in my parish church in Liturgy and Sacraments."

Alexander Knox: "I cannot doubt that, in the fulness of time, the Prayer Book will be accounted the richest treasure, next to the Canonical Scriptures, in the Christian Church."

Dr. Doddridge says: "Our Liturgy—the language is so plain, as to be level to the capacities of the meanest, and yet the sense is so noble as to raise the conception of the greatest."

Robert Hall, (a Baptist,) says of the Liturgy: "I believe that the evangelical purity of its sentiments, the chastised fervour of its devotion and the majestic simplicity of its language, have combined to place it in the very first rank of uninspired compositions."

Grotius, says: "Our Liturgy comes so near the primitive pattern, that none of the reformed Churches can compare with it."

The members of the Dutch Reformed denomination give their testimony as follows: "Her spirit stirring Liturgy and a scrupulous adherence to it, has under God, notwithstanding the mutations of men and things, and all the aspersions cast upon her, as coldness, formality and a want of evangelical feeling, we say, a *scrupulous* adherence to her Liturgy has preserved her integrity beyond any denomination of christians since the Reformation."

John Wesley: "I believe there is no Liturgy in the world which breathes more of a solid, scriptural, rational piety, than the Common Prayer of the Church of England—its language is not only pure, but strong and elegant in the highest degree."

Dr. Adam Clarke: "It is almost universally esteemed by the devout and pious of every denomination; a work which all who are acquainted with it, deem superior to every thing of the kind produced either by ancient or modern times, and several of the prayers and services in which were in use from the first ages of christianity and many of the best of them before the name of Pope or Popery was known in the earth—next to the Bible it is the Book of my understanding and of my heart."

Watson, a Methodist also, says: "Such a Liturgy makes the service of God's house appear more like our true business on the Lord's day; and besides the aid it affords to the most devout and spiritual, a great body of evangelical truth is, by constant use, laid up in the minds of children and ignorant people."

There were giants in those days, men beside whom Benjamin Nankeville, would present a sorry spectacle—men who apart from prejudice and party feeling, hesitated not to bestow upon the Church of England the meed of praise so justly due to her. The spirit which reigns in the breasts of too many modern sectaries was not known to them, who, weighing every thing in the scale of intrinsic merit, were not ashamed to give an honest testimony. Let this teach Churchmen that every cavil and attack upon this book of their love is unworthy of a candid, intelligent Christian; let it teach them to study and appreciate this inestimable treasure, sealed upon its every page with a martyr's blood, and let the expression of the generous and learned Adam Clarke be theirs. "The Prayer Book, next to the Bible is the book of our understandings and our hearts."

CHAPTER XVIII.

NUMERICAL STRENGTH NO PROOF OF A TRUE CHURCH.

We are vauntingly told of the "large increase" of the Methodist Society: "That the Methodists in the United States number about *seventeen and a half* to one Churchman,"

and that "The best of all is, God is with us." Supposing this to be true, which I very much doubt; still I have yet to learn that numerical strength is a proof of a true Church of God. The Bible speaks a different language. The Jews are the most numerous in Poland, Mohometans in Arabia, Brahmins in Hindostan; and would that gentleman affirm that one or all of these was a branch of "the true vine"—a part of the Church of Christ? What! The unrepenting children of Abraham a part of the Church of Christ—the followers of the Arabian impostor a branch of "the true vine"—the worshippers of Brahma, a scion of the parent stem! and were the Founder of Methodism on earth again, he would ask with equal surprise: Can Methodism, as it now is, be a Church of God? No; he would pronounce with a trumpet tongue the fulfilment of his prediction, "They have left the Church of England and God has left them."

CHAPTER XIX.

WESLEY A CHURCHMAN.

Mr. Wesley lived and died a member of the Church of England and to his latest breath urged his followers to imitate his example.

I am charged with "*a want of common honesty*" for selecting "*detached passages* from Mr. Wesley's works with a view of persuading the Methodists that they are departing from the principles of their Founder, without observing that Mr. Wesley's opinions underwent an entire change on these points."

In following up this subject, I shall undertake to prove that Mr. Wesley's opinions never underwent a change;—that he lived and died a Churchman and that he invariably urged upon his followers not to separate from the Church of England. I shall begin with 1746, that being the year in which he read "Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church."

1746.—"I dare not renounce communion with the Church of England. As a Minister I teach her doctrines; I use her offices; I conform to her Rubrics; I suffer reproach for my attachment to her. As a private member, I hold her doctrines; I join in her offices, in prayer, in hearing, in communicating. Vol. VIII, p. 444.

1747.—"We continually exhort all who attend on our preaching, to attend the offices of of the Church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there than ever they did before. Vol. VIII, p. 488.

1755.—"We began reading together "A Gentleman's Reasons for his Dissent from the Church of England." It is an elaborate and lively tract and contains the strength of the cause; but it did not yield us *one proof* that it is *lawful* for us, (much less our duty,) to separate from it. Vol. II, p. 328.

1758.—"In this year Mr. Wesley wrote his "Reasons against A Separation From The Church of England;" and in writing to Miss Bishop in 1778 he says: "These reasons were never yet answered and I believe they never will."

The Rev. Charles Wesley says of this Tract:

"I think myself bound in duty to add my testimony to my brother's. His twelve reasons against our ever separating from the Church of England are mine also. I subscribe to them with all my heart. My affection for the Church is as strong as ever; and I clearly see my calling; which is to live and to die in her communion. This, therefore, I am determined to do, the Lord being my Helper." Vol. XIII, p. 199.

1759.—"I received much comfort at the old Church in the morning, and at St. Thomas' in the afternoon. It was as if both the sermons were made for me. I pity those who can find no good at church! But how should they, if *prejudice* come between? An effectual bar to the grace of God." Vol. II, p. 478.

"I had appointed to preach at seven in the evening, at Bradford; but when I came, I found Mr. Hart was to preach at six; so I delayed till the Church service was ended, that there might not appear (on my part at least) even the shadow of opposition between us." Vol. II, p. 516.

1761.—"We had a long stage from hence to Swaldale, where I found an earnest, loving, simple people, whom I likewise exhorted not to leave the Church, though they had not the best of Ministers." Vol. III, p. 61.

1763.—"I then related what I had done since I came to Norwich first; and what I would do for the time to come, particularly that I would immediately put a stop to preaching in the time of Church service." Vol. III, p. 152.

1766.—"I see clearer and clearer none will keep to us, unless they keep to the Church. Whoever separates from the Church will separate from the Methodists." Vol. III, p. 260.

1767.—"I rode to Yarmouth, and found the Society, after the example of Mr. W——p,

had entirely left the Church. I judged it needful to speak largely upon that head. They stood reproved and resolved, one and all, to go to it again." Vol. III, p. 272.

1768.—"I advise all, over whom I have any influence, steadily to keep to the Church." Vol. III, p, 337.

1770.—"We had a poor sermon at church. However, I went again in the afternoon, remembering the words of Mr. Philip Henry: 'If the preacher does not know his duty, I bless God that I know mine.'" Vol. III, p. 401.

1772.—"I attended the Church of England service in the morning and that of the Kirk in the afternoon. Truly, 'no man having drunk old wine, straightway, desireth new.'—How dull and dry the latter appeared to me, who had been accustomed to the former."—Vol. III, p, 463.

1775.—"Understanding that almost all the Methodists by the advice of Mr. ——, had left the Church, I earnestly exhorted them to return to it." Vol. IV, p. 64.

1777.—"They (the Methodists) have read the writings of the most eminent pleaders for separation, both in the last and present century. They have spent several days in a General Conference upon this very question. 'Is it *expedient* (supposing, not granting, that it is *lawful*) to separate from the Established Church?' But still they could see no sufficient cause to depart from their first resolution. So that their fixed purpose is, let the clergy or laity use them well or ill, by the grace of God, to endure all things, to hold on their even course, and to continue in the Church, maugre men or devils, unless God permits them to be thrust out." Vol. VII, p. 428.

1778.—"The original Methodists were all of the Church of England, and the more awakened they were, the more zealously they adhered to it in every point, both of doctrine and discipline. Hence we inserted in the very first Rules of our Society: "They that leave the church leave *us*." And this we did, not as a point of *prudence*, but a point of *conscience*." Vol. XIII, p 134.

1785.—"Finding a report had been spread abroad that I was just going to leave the Church, to satisfy those that were grieved concerning it, I openly declared in the evening that I had now no more thought of separating from the Church, than I had forty years ago." Vol. IV, p. 320.

1786.—"Whenever there is any Church service, I do not approve of any appointment the same hour; because I love the Church of England, and would assist, not oppose it, all I can." Vol. XIII, p. 55.

This is taken from a letter to the Rev. Freeborn Garretson of the Methodist Society in America, and clearly shows that in no instance did he suffer anything to be done to oppose the Church of England, whether in the States or at home.

1787.—"I went over to Deptford, but it seemed I was got into a den of lions. Most of the leading men of the Society were mad for separating from the Church. I endeavoured to reason with them but in vain; they had neither *sense* nor even good manners left. At length after meeting the whole Society, I told them, "If you are resolved, you may have your service in church hours; but remember from that time, you will see my face no more." This struck deep; and from that hour I have heard no more of separating from the Church." Vol. IV, p. 357.

1788.—"This is the peculiar glory of the people called Methodists. In spite of all manner of temptations they will not separate from the church. What many so earnestly covet, they abhor. They will not be a distinct body." Vol. XIII, p. 232.

1789—"Unless I see more reason for it than I ever yet saw, I will not leave the Church of England, as by law established *while the breath of God is in my nostrils*." Vol. XIII, p. 238.

"I never had any design of separating from the Church; I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it when I am no more seen. I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many will separate from it."

"In flat opposition to these, I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it." Vol. XIII, p. 240.

"I believe one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long is, to confirm them in their present purpose, not to separate from the Church. Vol. VII, p. 278.

"I dare not separate from the Church, I believe it would be a sin so to do—I have been true to my profession from 1730 to this day." Vol. VII, p. 279.

In this year Mr. Wesley wrote seven more reasons against separating from the church.

1790.—"I have been uniform both in doctrine and discipline for above these fifty years; and it is a little too late for me to turn into a new path now I am grey-headed." Vol. XII, p. 439.

The Methodists in general are members of the Church of England. They hold all her doctrines, attend her service, and partake of her sacraments." Vol. XIII, p. 119.

1791.—THIRTY DAYS BEFORE HIS DEATH.

"See that you never give place to one thought of separating from your brethren in Europe. Lose no opportunity of declaring to all men, that the Methodists are one people in all the world and that it is their full determination so to continue."* Vol. XIII, p. 127.

WESLEY ON HIS DEATH BED.

"We thank thee, O Lord, for these and all thy mercies. Bless the *Church* and King.—And grant us truth and peace through Jesus Christ our Lord forever and ever."

Thus far, I think, I have shown that the opinions of Wesley never changed on this point either before or after the reading of "Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church."

WESLEY IN HIS TOMB.

"He was born the 17th of June, 1702, and died the 2nd of March 1791. He was the Founder of the *Methodist Societies* and the chief promoter and patron of the plan of itinerant preaching, which he extended through Great Britain and Ireland, the West Indies and America with unexampled success."

CHAPTER XX.

THE EARLY METHODIST PREACHERS AND THE DECISIONS OF CONFERENCE.

We have now to consider the opinions of the collective body of Preachers in Conference, as recorded by Mr. Wesley, and if they in every respect harmonise with what I have just stated, what becomes of Mr. Nankeville's assertion that I am guilty of "a want of common honesty," in selecting "*detached passages*" to persuade "the Methodists that they are departing from the principles of their Founder."

1755.—"We desired all the Preachers to speak their minds at large: "Whether we ought to separate from the Church ?" Whatever was advanced on one side or the other was seriously and calmly considered; and on the third day we were all fully agreed in that general conclusion, that (whether it was *lawful* or not) it was no ways *expedient*." Vol. II, p. 329.

1756.—"We then largely considered the necessity of keeping in the Church, and using the clergy with tenderness; and there was no dissenting voice. God gave us all to be of one mind and of one judgment. My brother and I closed the Conference by a solemn declaration of our purpose, never to separate from the Church, and all our brethren concurred therein." Vol. II, p. 385.

1760.—"I took my ease, riding in a chaise to Limerick; where on Saturday 5th, ten of us met in a little Conference. By the blessing of God, we were all of one mind, particularly with regard to the Church. Even J—— D——, has not now the least thought of leaving it, but attends there, be the Minister good or bad." Vol. III, p. 9.

1769.—"Let us keep to the Church over and above all the reasons that were formerly given for this, we add another *now from long experience*—they that leave the Church leave the Methodists." Minutes of Conference Works 1810. Vol. VI, p. 388.

1778.—"Our little Conference began, at which about twenty Preachers were present. On Wednesday we heard one of our friends at large upon the duty of leaving the Church; but after a full discussion of the point, we all remained firm in our judgment—that it is our duty not to leave the Church, wherein God has blessed us and does bless us still." Vol. IV, p. 131.

1786.—"Our conference began; about eighty preachers attended. On Thursday, in the afternoon, we permitted any of the Society to be present and weighed what was said about separating from the Church. But we all determined to continue therein without one dissenting voice." Vol. IV, p. 343.

1788.—"One of the most important points considered at this Conference, was that of leaving the Church. The sum of a long conversation was: That in a course of fifty years we had neither premeditatedly nor willingly varied from it in one article either of doctrine or discipline. That we were not yet conscious of varying from it in any point of doctrine ———." Vol. IV, p. 432.

1789.—THE LAST CONFERENCE MR. WESLEY EVER ATTENDED IN IRELAND.

"Our little Conference began in Dublin and ended Tuesday 7. On this I observe I never had between forty or fifty such Preachers together in Ireland before; all of them, we had reason to hope, alive to God and earnestly devoted to his service. I never saw such a number of Preachers before, so unanimous in all points, particularly as to leaving the

* The Work of Mr. Wesley from which I have quoted is the "Third London Edition, with the last corrections of the Author, published by John Mason, 14 City Road, London"

Church; which none of them had the least thought of. It is no wonder, that there has been this year so large an increase of the Society." Vol. IV, p. 464.

1789.—THE LAST CONFERENCE MR. WESLEY EVER ATTENDED IN ENGLAND.

The Conference began; about a hundred Preachers were present, and never was our Master more eminently present with us. The case of separation from the Church was largely considered, and we were all unanimous against it." Vol. IV, p. 466.

So far we hear not one word of separation from the Church of England, and I challenge all the Methodists living to convict me of wilful misrepresentation in this or in any other statement that I have made with regard to John Wesley. I have set down the extracts and given vol. and page, that every one may examine for himself. Before concluding this subject I wish to guard you against a vile perversion of the truth adopted by the Methodists, in giving Wesley as authority for suffering them to hold their preaching during Church hours. It appears that in 1789 Wesley suffered the Methodists to meet at "the Room in Dublin, during Church hours from which they take *the exception for the rule*, and thereby try to justify the course pursued by them in this country. Let Mr. Wesley speak for himself and we shall learn the motive which induced him to do this.

"March, Sunday 29, 1789. Came safe to Dublin quay. I went straight up to the new Room. Monday 30. I began preaching at five in the morning; and the congregation both then and the following mornings, was far larger in proportion than those at London.—Meantime, I had letter upon letter concerning the Sunday service; but I could not give any answer, till I had made a full inquiry both into the occasion and the effects of it. The occasion was this:—About two years ago it was complained, that few of our Society attended the Church on Sunday; most of them either sitting at home or going on Sunday morning to some Dissenting meeting. Hereby many of them were hurt and inclined to separate from the Church. To *prevent* this, it was proposed to have service at the Room, which I consented to, on condition that they would attend St. Patrick's, every first Sunday in the month. The effect was: 1. That they went no more to the meetings. 2. That three times more went to St. Patrick's (perhaps six times) in six or twelve months, than had done for ten or twenty years before. Observe! This is done, not to *prepare* for, but to *prevent*, a separation from the Church."

Thus you see that it was to decoy them back to the Church, that Wesley departed from his rule in this particular—it was to *prevent* a separation and not to *prepare* for it.

CHAPTER XXI.

CHURCH AND STATE.

All the scurrility heaped upon our Church in consequence of her connexion with the State is totally uncalled for, even were it true. The grievances alleged do not exist, either at home or in this country. Nevertheless, that Mr. Nankeville may not again be guilty of expressing himself with so much rudeness and indecency as characterise his late production, I commend to his serious consideration the defence of the constitution of the Church of England by Mr. Wesley in a letter to the Rev Mr. Toogood; vol. X, p. 501; which is too lengthy for insertion; and also to No. II, Wesleyan Tracts for the Times, where in page 10 we are told; "The *Wesleyan* Methodists are not Dissenters in the ordinary sense and application of that term; for they do not dissent from the principle of a *National Ecclesiastical Establishment* which derives a just measure of protection and support from its *union with the State;* nor do they dissent from the *Doctrine or General Formularies of the Church of England.*"

I shall conclude this subject with the following extract.

"The established Church is peculiarly "the Church of the poor man." Was there ever a truth more undeniable than this, or one more pregnant with vast and awful consequences? The parish Church is open to the whole community. The humblest inhabitant of this wide realm, the most destitute pauper that knows not where else to seek a resting place, enters therein with a spirit, humble indeed, as befits him, towards his Maker, but, towards man, erect in conscious equality of brotherhood with the wealthiest and noblest of his fellow creatures. Shut then, the door of this house of God, by taking away the legalized subsistence of its ministers and by refusing the fund which protects it from dilapidation—what follows? The rich and noble, the independent, the comfortable, the competent, the tradesman, the artisan in competent employment—all who have wherewith to feed and clothe their families, and to pay something towards the maintenance of a Church, and the support of its minister—all such can by money obtain a right of admission and can hear the word of God

without impediment; but what becomes of him who has no money, who can contribute nothing, who has not bought his way into the list of the congregation? What does the "voluntary principle" do for him? Let him try a meeting house of political Dissenters; let him try any place of worship raised, and its minister maintained by subscription, or by money contribution under any form, and see what will be the success of his application to the porter or functionary who keeps the gate. For the very poor who cannot afford to pay, there is no help in the "voluntary principle." But in the Established Church, those who pay not a farthing are entitled, as their indefeasible birthright, to receive all which can be there supplied to the worn down spirit and the broken heart—the solemn prayer—the inspired word—the holy sacrament—that peace and blessing which the world cannot give, but of which our charitable advocates for "religious liberty" would, in their beneficence, despoil the children of affliction—the chosen ones of Christ! Yes, the Established Church of England is emphatically "the poor man's Church," and cursed be he who would destroy it. The Established Clergy are the poor man's ministers; they are bound to yield him, when called upon, and they do yield him, spiritual instruction and consolation, as ordained by the law under which he lives; and cursed again, we say, is he who would rob the poor man of this inalienable possession here—this passport to his immortal inheritance in a better world." Allison's French Revolution.

CHAPTER XXII.

SCHISM.

We are told that "*Schism* can exist where there is no separation—that those cannot be branded with the '*Sin of Schism*,' who separate from the insufferable intolerance manifested by the Clergy of the Church of England in this Province." "That it is not a separation *from* any Church, but a separation *in* a Church," and that consequently the Methodists are not Schismatics.

We will examine how this agrees with the teaching of Methodism in England and Canada. In "The Wesleyan Tracts for the Time," No. 11, we find the following definition of Schism. "Schism literally denotes a *rent*, a *cleft*, *fissure* or *rupture*, a *division*." and then unblushingly we are told: "The Wesleyan Methodists are not Schismatics *in* the Church, for this plain reason that—they are separated *from* the Church," and so speaks Mr. Nankeville.

Fancy the followers of Wesley, who call themselves by his name, defending themselves against the charge of *Schism* on the plea that they are not now *in* the Church of England—that they are separated *from* it;—"glorying in their shame"! Fancy this, I say, and then in your hearts bless God that he was not spared to see this *evil* day.

But let us examine the definition of *Schism* given by the Methodist Society of Canada in Conference at Kingston in 1834, in their Annual Address, when their body was torn asunder by rival interests.

To separate *from* a Christian community, with feelings which involve an alienation of affection from the people of God, solely on account of matters, which, if allowed to be of some importance, are yet confessedly of minor consideration, is, at all times, we conceive *so infinitely beneath the noble and generous spirit of the gospel—so obviously opposed to reason and moderation—so contrary to the example of the holiest and best of Christians, in every age of the Church—and is so clearly a snare of Satan to divert the minds of men from the great and momentous subjects of experimental and practical religion*, that we are, *in conscience* bound, especially on this occasion, to *warn* our societies at large against the very *appearance* of so great an *evil*. Such *alienation of affection*, whether it lead to open separation or manifests itself only in internal broils and agitations, is, according to the interpretation of the *venerable Wesley*, strictly and properly *the schism* which St. Paul has mentioned, as occasioning such *mischief* in the Corinthian Church; and which has been frequently *more injurious to the cause of God than the attacks of infidelity itself*."

What say you to this? The Methodist body in Conference in 1834 tells us that: "To separate *from* a Christian community—*is contrary to the example of the holiest and best of Christians in every age of the Church—is clearly the snare of Satan to divert the minds of men from the great and momentous subjects of experimental and practical religion, and that such is* according to the interpretation of the *venerable Wesley*, strictly and properly *the schism* mentioned by St. Paul, which is frequently *more injurious to the cause of God than the attacks of infidelity itself*; and Benjamin Nankeville, one of its preachers, in 1849, tells us *the very opposite*, to justify *their* separation from the Church of England! Is not this fearful?

Is not this a *snare of Satan?* And that there is nothing which can justify the separation of the Methodists from the Church is evident, Wesley himself being witness. Hear him:

"After justifying "Calvin and Luther, with their followers, for separating from the Church of Rome," on the plea that they could not "continue therein, upon any other terms than subscribing to all the errors of that Church and joining in all their superstition and idolatry;" Wesley says: There were not the same reasons why various bodies of men should afterwards separate from the Church of England. No sinful terms of communion were imposed upon them; neither are at this day. Most of them separated either because of some opinions or some modes of worship which they did not approve of. Few of them assigned the unholiness either of the Clergy or laity as the cause of their separation. And if any did so, it did not appear that they themselves were a jot better than those they separated from." Vol. VII, p. 183.

There are now in England, besides several minor branches, "The Old Connexion Methodists—The New Methodists—the Church or Primitive Methodists—The Primitive Methodists or Ranters—The Independent Methodists or Ryanites—The Tent Methodists —The New Connexion Methodists."

In the United States there are *nine* distinct bodies of the Methodists, viz: "Methodists Episcopal—Methodists Protestant—Reformed Methodists—Wesleyan Methodists—German Methodists—Allbright Methodists—Methodist Episcopal South." Millerite Methodists, Universalist Methodists.

In Canada we have British Wesleyan Methodists—Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada—Episcopal Methodists—Primitive Methodists—Ryanites—Kilhamites—Arminian Episcopal Methodists, and others for aught I know, and so bigoted are these diversified varieties of Wesley's pretended systems to their own peculiar followers, that they will not open their meeting houses to their schismatical brethren.

Marvel not at these things,—marvel not that they are no longer "*one people in all the world.*" The reason is obvious: "They have left the Church of England and God has left them."

In the annals of time there has never appeared before the world so false and contradictory a system as Modern Methodism. No assertion is too gross, no means too vile, when the Church of their *first love* is to be assailed! But what else can be expected? Are they not *Schismatics?* "They have left the Church of England and God has left them."

Were more required to prove this, than what I have already brought forward, I could adduce abundance, but will rest satisfied with giving one of Mr. Nankeville's extracts as a *specimen* of the rest.

In page 37 of his "Vindication," he informs us that Wesley "in a letter to a friend who taxed him with contradicting his subscription to the 23d article, by allowing lay preachers," says:

"They (the Methodist Clergy) 'subscribed it in the simplicity of their hearts, when they firmly believed none but episcopal ordination valid. But Bishop Stillingfleet has since fully convinced them, that this was an entire mistake."

Mr. Nankeville, to answer his own wicked ends and prop up a falling system, by pawning upon the world the belief that there were Methodist *Ministers* in those days, says:

"They (the Methodist Clergy) &c." BUT—

Mr. Wesley says: "They (two or three Clergymen of the Church of England) &c."—Vol. XIII, p. 203.

It is painful to be compelled even to allude to such a disreputable, such a dishonest course, as that pursued by the Author of the "Vindication" of Methodism in foisting upon his readers for true extracts, the most bare-faced and shameless suppression of important passages—passages, which if given, would contradict his assumptions,—would prove him to be a wilful and willing deceiver. It is painful, but truth requires it and to truth we must yield.

CHAPTER XXIII.

POPERY OUTSTRIPPED.

The following coming from one who has been thirty years a Methodist preacher, and whose sole object seems to be, to make Methodism respected by "the impartial, intelligent and pious of other denominations," is deserving of notice. In recapitulating the "leading points" of his argument he says:

"Every one will perceive with what rapidity we have advanced in our career of ambition and glory; and with what boldness the pretensions of our bishops* have been set forth by

* Witness Bishop Nankeville!!!

themselves or their advocates. In forty years we have outstripped Rome herself, in her march to grandeur; and it would seem, that what some writers have affirmed respecting the Western hemisphere, namely, that every thing in America is upon a larger and grander scale, and that the natural productions sooner arrive at maturity here, than on the Eastern continent, is to be verified in our church matters also. We began our church establishment a few years ago, and rested the foot of our ecclesiastical ladder upon Mr. Wesley's authority; but his authority was soon rejected.* The first step of our ladder is the identity of bishops and presbyters, or two orders. The second, "episcopal authority" with limitations and restrictions. The third three distinct orders. The fourth "a presbyterian ordination and an episcopal ordination as good as any in the world." The fifth, Methodist bishops "very much resemble" primitive evangelists. The sixth, "divine authority" for episcopal power. The seventh, a right "to over-rule the spiritual and temporal concerns of the church." The eighth, "divine right" to legislate for the church to the exclusion of local preachers and laymen. By such steps have we advanced to the ground we now occupy; and time alone can develope what other steps may be added in the progress of the work. We have no idea, however, that the present bishops have found a stopping place: nor that they or their successors will voluntarily relinquish one particle of their authority. Indeed, we are rather inclined to think they will still continue their exertions to ascend.—And that what was said of the bishops of another church, may be said by the future historian respecting them. "It is very remarkable that of the one hundred and fourteen Popes between Boniface III, who laid the foundation of the papal grandeur, and Gregory VII, who raised it to the highest pitch, not one ever lost an inch of ground his predecessor had gained."

Add to this, the fact, that Episcopacy is now superseded, "unless it will jeopard their church property," in which case they will assume it again for "filthy lucre's sake," and who can deny the fulfilment of Mr. Wesley's prediction. "They have left the Church of England and God has left them."

In recommending adherence to the advice of Mr. Wesley the same writer says: "Unless they do it, in the name of goodness and truth, let them make no more reference to Mr. Wesley's 'recommendation' or 'counsel;' and until it is done let us hear no more about *Wesleyan Methodism*." The History of Methodist Episcopacy by Alexander McCaine.

*Mr. Wesley's name was struck off the Minutes of Conference in 1787 by his ungrateful followers, and so deeply did he feel the injury that Dr. Coke, speaking of the act, says, "I doubt much whether the cruel usage he received in Baltimore in 1787, when he was excommunicated, (wonderful and most unparalleled step) did not hasten his death. Indeed I little doubt it. For from the time he was informed of it, he began to hang down his head and to think he had lived long enough." For appearance sake, and to attach more importance to their society, they 'struck it on again in 1789;' but to fill up the measure of their ingratitude when Wesley died in 1791, they would not suffer his death to be recorded in their minutes. Thomas Weatherford, Peter Massie and George Browning, whose collective labours in the Methodist ministry did not amount to ten years, died in the same year, and their deaths are recorded with approbation, while good John Wesley, the Father and Founder of Methodism, who was entered on their Minutes as a Bishop, at the time of his death—who had laboured upwards of *sixty years*, and who had filled the eye of the religious world for half a century, was thought unworthy of notice. The history of Methodism presents nothing equal to this, and coming from a body which in 1784 recorded in their Minutes that "During the life of the Rev. Mr. Wesley we acknowledge ourselves his sons in the Gospel, ready in matters belonging to church government to obey his commands" is without a parallel in the religious world; yet these men call themselves Wesleyan! nay, more; the Methodists in Canada, in their annual address for 1843, call upon their deluded followers to 'GIVE a PRIMITIVE WESLEYAN character to their words, spirit and conduct.' Is not this enough to make Satan laugh—is it not enough to make angels weep? The moment Mr Wesley's name was struck off, the name of Bishop was assumed!

CONCLUSION.

Now that I have examined all the leading features of the "Vindication of the Methodist Church," will any honest, God fearing man say that that can be a Church of God which is begun, continued and ended in falsehood? Can that be a Church of God whose Preachers stop at nothing, however gross, to bolster up their cherished system? Can that be a Church of God which has not God's sacraments? Impossible. "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Yes, but, says the Methodist, notwithstanding all this I am determined to remain a Methodist. I see such good fruit in Methodism—I see such holy men belonging to it.

Be not deceived, my friend, by the outward appearance. Is this some of the *good fruit* of Methodism that I have been examining? I do not dispute that there are good and sincere people among the Methodists. There are good and sincere Roman Catholics;—there are good and sincere Mahometans;—even in heathen Rome they could boast of a Regulus and Fabricius; but what is that to the point? Because there are good Roman Catholics would you feel justified in becoming one? or, because there are good Mahometans would you on that account embrace the false creed of the Arabian impostor? or, because heathen Rome could boast of its worthies would you therefore desire to shake off the restraints of christianity and become a heathen? But take care that you do not overrate the goodness which you fancy in Methodism. I myself thought Mr. Nankeville a christian,—and declared so in my congregation. You thought James Sykes one of the chosen of God. Do you think so now? Allow me to tell you that it is only on the great day of account that the real character can be known. It is only when summoned before that "Almighty God unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid," that the sheep will be separated from the goats. Trust not therefore to fancied goodness;—trust rather to the words of the living God and rend not the seamless garment of our Saviour;—tear not assunder, by divisions, the Church of Christ, "which is his body." "It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh."

MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST SOCIETY:

It is a source of deep grief to me to be compelled to bring the conduct of your Preacher thus prominently forward. There are many among you who, I feel convinced, condemn in severe terms the course pursued by that man: but after a personal attack had been made upon my honour and my honesty—after the truth of my statements had been impeached in the most uncourteous and unbecoming language;—after I had been branded as *mean, dishonourable and void of common honesty*;—after I had been falsified in a public Journal by another of your Preachers, James Sykes, the friend of Mr. Nankeville, who before he went to the States, left me word that 'I might prosecute him if I could,' could I suffer such falsehoods to pass by unnoticed, uncontradicted? Charge me not with want of charity in exposing the system, which, perhaps in an unguarded moment, you have espoused. A desire to be faithful to God, to his Church and your souls, deserves a different epithet.—Can you call that man unkind who warns you of approaching danger and points to the path of safety? Call me rather your dearest friend, your most faithful counsellor. Your respected Founder said many hard things against some of the Clergy of the Church, and in doing so, lest his language might be misunderstood, he tells us they are not the church —that "unless they are holy men, earnestly loving and serving God, they are not even members of the Church: they are no part of it. And unless they preach the doctrines of the church, contained in her Articles and Liturgy, they are no true Ministers of the church, but are eating her bread and tearing out her bowels." Vol. XII, p. 240. But when was he ever known to speak a word against *The Church of England?* In it he lived, in it he died, and even when the mysteries of another world were opening to his view and disclosing its awful realities, he bequeathed to her the last legacy he had to bestow, his dying blessing, "O Lord, bless the Church." Hear his language in this particular and then judge whether the course pursued by his followers is such as he would have sanctioned. "The doctrines we preach are the doctrines of the Church of England; indeed the fundamental doctrines of the Church, clearly laid down both in her Prayers, Articles and Homilies." Vol. I, p. 224. Again, "Methodism, so called is the old religion, the religion of the Bible, the religion of the Primitive Church, the religion of the Church of England," Vol. VII, p. 423. Again, "I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England. I love her Liturgy, I approve her plan of discipline, and only wish it could be put in execution." Vol. VII, p. 278, A. D., 1789. What fairness then is there in applying all he said of a few of the clergy to the Church, whose doctrines he *held and taught?*

You may possibly suppose there is no great harm in separating from the Church:—that the difference is only trifling between us, and that on that account no danger is to be apprehended. Say not so, I beseech you; the difference is greater than you, at first sight imagine, and what warrant have you that your error of judgment, as you choose to call it, will be suffered to pass unpunished? Those who entered and kept within the ark were safe, while those who remained without, whether their distance was far or near, perished in the waters. Uzzah, with the best intention possible, touched the ark which the priests only were suffered to touch, and he was struck dead for his error. Your position, as Schismatics, is a fearfully dangerous one; the Bible being witness, Wesley being witness, the Minutes of your own Conference being witness, Stillingfleet, your supposed friend, being witness, who pronounces it "as great and dangerous a sin as *murder*, and in some respects beyond it." I call upon you, I beseech you, to ponder these things seriously in your hearts. Show not such disrespect to that good man, whose name you bear, by still separating from his Church and your Church,—from his God and your God. May the God of unity and peace heal all your backslidings, remove your prejudices and bring you back to the fold which your Founder charged you never to abandon, the pure, the scriptural, the good Church of England.

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

After what I have now said, I trust that this is the last time it will be necessary for me to warn you against the sin of entering a "Methodist Meeting House." You have heard the fearful consequences of schism, you have seen the falsity of its teaching; I beseech, you, therefore as one that watches over you for your good to "mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and *avoid* them; for they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Think not that there is no harm in an occasional visit to the meeting-house, to indulge an idle curiosity or to hear a sermon. If it be a sin to go *frequently*, it is a sin to go *once*. *One* theft is a violation of God's holy word and so is *one* act of schism. It is these occasional visits that may cause you to become what at present may be farthest from your thoughts, a *Schismatic*, an enemy to the Church of God. The progress of sin is easy and deceptive. When Hazael, King of Syria, was told the enormities which he afterwards would commit, he was surprised, and asked with indignation: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing?" and yet you all know the result; how he not only perpetrated the enormities but took pleasure in doing so. Who are the greatest enemies to the Church in this country, in this neighborhood?—Men who, perhaps like you, thought it no harm to go once in a while to the "Meeting house." St. Paul cautions us to "abstain from all *appearance* of evil," and Mr. Wesley tells us that a separation from the Church, if it ever took place, would be an evil. In truth I cannot see how men can bow their knees before God, and day after day pray of him 'not to lead them into temptation,' and, with such words on their lips, go to the 'Methodist Meeting;' and yet many not only go themselves, but thoughtlessly lead their children with them. Surely there can be no greater inconsistency than this! You would not wish your child to frequent a tavern, lest he might contract a love for liquor—you would not wish him to go to a shanty, lest he might become a swearer, and yet you send or take him to a meeting house, and at the same time say: you would not wish him to become a Dissenter! Was there ever such inconsistency as this? Exercise the same judgment in the religion of your children that you do in what concerns their temporal advantages, and I fear nothing.

O, it is wonderful how tenaciously error when once impressed upon the mind clings to it! Keep then your children from Methodist Sunday Schools. As members of a Church which challenges inquiry and says to all her members: "Prove all things" we ought to be grateful; but never should we allow those principles to be invaded, and above all, the religious instruction of our children to be contaminated with error and delusion. It is the willing yielding of unthinking churchmen to dissent that is crippling the energies of the Church—it is this thoughtless yielding to schismatical guides that is clipping the wings of truth. Were it not for it, we would have a Clergyman in every Township; the religion of Jesus would be known and appreciated throughout the length and breadth of the land. You who advance dissent, either by your countenance or support, are retarding the progress of the gospel by assisting in disseminating error, and multiplying Societies. Whilst there is a Church of England Clergyman needed in Canada—whilst there is *one single congregation* deprived of the ministrations of our holy Church, they who contribute the smallest, the most trifling sum, to the support of dissent are committing a deep and a lasting sin, by enabling the enemies of the Church to perpetuate their errors and widen the breach from generation to generation.

Schismatics are in Scripture classed with "fornicators, covetous, idolators, railers, drunkards, extortioners," with whom Chistians are not to keep company. 1 Cor. V, 11. Rom. XVI, 17, 18. Jude is very explicit on this point: "These be they who separate them-

selves, sensual, *not having* the Spirit." Cyprian, one of the early Fathers, says: "Let no man imagine that good men can depart from the Church; the wind scattereth not the wheat, nor doth the storm overthrow the tree supported by a solid root. Empty straws are tossed by the tempest; weak trees are prostrated by the violence of the whirlwind. Such as these are execrated and smote by John the Apostle, saying: 'They went out from us, but they were not of us.' &c." From which we may conclude that voluntary separation from the Church of Christ is a sin against our brethren, against ourselves, against God; a sin which unless repented of, will be eternally destructive to the soul. The Methodists well know that their ship is fast sinking—that their craft is in danger of being set at nought, and notwithstanding they are convicted of the sin of schism, in departing from the principles of their Founder, they still persist in exclaiming, Great is Wesley of the Wesleyans. Methodism shuns examination, it shrinks from investigation, well knowing that its claims to be a Church of God are founded on falsehood; and to prevent inquiry, as much as possible the Clergy of the Church are branded with opprobrious names, such as Puseyite, High Church and others of that kind with which every Methodist seems familiar. But falsehood and slander will never deter me from doing my duty. No, were it to estrange from me those dearest to my heart, I will, with God's blessing, fearlessly proclaim the truth and leave the rest to Him. A word more:

Having been informed that Mr. Nankeville was concocting another "Vindication," I hereby caution all whom it may concern from regarding anything as truth which emanates from that individual.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no *divisions* among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." "Mark them which cause *divisions* and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and *avoid* them." Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

APPENDIX.

I have lately heard that Mr. Nankeville has given up the idea of edifying the world with any more "Vindications," and has turned his attention to the writing of Letters on Confirmation, Baptismal Regeneration, &c., &c., and something about Methodism.

On the first, Confirmation, I had thought he had exhausted his supply of falsehood, but it would appear that I had underrated his capabilities in that line. He is not to be daunted by trifles, and when he cannot get material at hand to answer, can at all times *forge* in the same workshop to suit his purposes and supply the market.

Next comes the subject of Baptismal Regeneration, and coming from the pen of Benjamin Nankeville will, I have no doubt, be worthy of a place in the curiosity shop of every vender of schism. I had thought of treating the matter with silent contempt, well knowing that in so doing I should have the concurrence of every upright man; yet, lest the ignorant and unthinking might be led away by his sophistry and falsehood, I hereby subjoin "a form of sound words" in parallel columns, which will, I trust, show that the views of the Church of England, on this point, are in accordance with Scripture, and are those of four-fifths of christendom—that they are the views of Mr. Wesley and of the Wesleyan connexion in England, together with the Church of Scotland, whose "Confession of Faith" is signed by all her Clergy.

Scripture References.	Church of England.—Article XXVII; of Baptism.—"Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new birth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of Forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed & sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of Prayer unto God.—The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."	"*The Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly* 1647, *and ratified and established by acts of Parliament* 1649 *and* 1690, *as the public and avowed Confession of the Church of Scotland.*" Chap XXVIII; of Baptism.—"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; which sacrament is by Christ's own appointment to be continued in his Church until the end of the world,"	John Wesley and Wesleyans.—'I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England.'—Vol. VII, p. 278, A. D. 1789. "I dare not renounce the Church of England. As a minister, I teach her doctrines; I use her offices; I conform to her Rubrics."—Vol. VIII, p. 444. "It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again, and it is allowed that the whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants."—Vol. VI, p. 74. "Who denies that ye were then (in baptism) made children of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven?" "I allow that ye were circumcised with the circumcision of Christ as St. Paul emphatically terms baptism,"—*Sermon, 'Marks of the New Birth.'* "The Wesleyan Methodists do not dissent from the Doctrine or General Formularies of the Church of England.'—*Wesl'n Tracts for the Times, No. 2, p. 10.*

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—John III: 5.			

"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. II: 12.

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Gal. III: 27.

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."—Titus III: 5.

"Then Peter said unto them: Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts II: 38.

"I allow that ye were circumcised with the circumcision of Christ as St. Paul emphatically terms baptism,"—*Sermon, 'Marks of the New Birth.'*

"The Wesleyan Methodists do not dissent from the Doctrine or General Formularies of the Church of England.'—*Wesl'n Tracts for the Times, No. 2, p. 10.*

The proposal of Dr. Coke to Bishop White was laid before the Convocation of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held at New York in Sept., 1792. See McCaine's History, in which Coke's letter is recorded in full, together with one from Bishop White, on the subject. See also "The Defence of our Fathers, published by N. Bangs & J. Emory, for the Methodist Episcopal Church at the, Conference Office, Crosby Street," New York, in which these letters are acknowledged, and in a letter to Bishop Asbury, dated "Near Leeds, Feb'y 2, 1808," Dr. Coke mentions his proposals to Bishop White for a re-ordination of the Preachers. Add to these things the fact that Dr. Coke applied to the Bishop of London to "ordain a given number of the leading Preachers—to administer the Sacraments," (Drew's Life of Coke, page 289,) which he never would have done had he authority to ordain.

Since writing the above, I have received Mr. N's "Series of Letters," which I must say are worthy of the author; as like his "Vindication," they are a tissue of falsehood thro'-out. He makes a grievous complaint at not getting my manuscript, although he demanded it two days *after* it had gone to press to Ogdensburgh. Such chicanery is well worthy of Mr. N. He knew that I had not it to give him, as I mentioned publicly in my congregation before a large body of Methodists, on the last Sunday that I preached it, the *particular day* on which I would send it away, that any applications for it, might be made *before* that time. On three successive Sundays I proffered it, or extracts from it, to any one that desired them, but as in the former* instance he preferred *false extracts* taken by some of his own school. Had I the manuscript I should have given it with pleasure, and, to put the matter beyond all doubt, I hereby declare that he shall have it whenever he has the courage to come for it and meet me face to face before the public. I am not afraid of the light and the day, and will give Mr. N. another chance of redeeming his character. He is trying to shelter himself behind some remarks of Dr. Spencer, and has, as I am informed sundry affidavits for that purpose to blind the eyes of his hearers and gull the Conference, which will soon meet; but such a mean and dishonest subterfuge will not screen him with any honest body of men. Let him meet me, or let the Conference take up the matter, and I will take off the mask and expose him in his naked deformity. I invited him and the whole body of Methodists to examine the authors from which I quoted; why am I denied a similar privilege? I answer: because he could not produce them. I tell him he dare not meet me. He too well knows that as long as his barefaced and shameless falsehoods have not been brought before the bar of a public meeting he will get *some* to believe them; but he knows that were he to meet me he would have no cloak for his sin; his falsehood, imposture and chicanery, would then he brought to light and draw down upon him the odium of every upright man. And this is the man who undertakes to write upon Baptismal Regeneration! Shame upon him!! Shame upon him!!!

In page 12 of this Review it will be seen that Mr. N. quoted the letters of orders, as they are called, from John Wesley to Dr. Coke falsely; and what think you of his audacity in referring me, in page 21 of his "Letters" to "Drew's Dife of Dr. Coke, page 66" for these letters of orders, where they are to be found *precisely as given by me.* I have also compared them with the same in "The Defence of our Fathers," page 23, and in M'Caine's History, page 31, all of which correspond with that copy, given in this Review. Such unblushing effrontery as this ought to be enough to condemn Mr. N. in the eyes of the world, and compels us to pity the flock over which he is sent to preside. I challenge all the Methodist Preachers in Canada, collectively or individually; and defy them to prove that the extracts in Mr. Nankevill's "Vindication" are other than falsehoods. *Assertions* will not do. We must have *proof.*

Having just had a conversation with a warm friend of Mr. Nankeville, he said to me, "If Mr. Nankeville would tell a lie I would not believe any Preacher in Canada, I think him so good a man. Has he not given the *very pages* from which he took his extracts, and surely he would not do that unless he spoke the truth." Now, to convince the world that Mr. N. does not speak the truth, I will take one book (Drew's Life of Coke,) as a specimen of the rest, and examine it.

In page 29 of his "Vindication" he refers me to page 100 of Coke's Life, to which extract he *adds one and a half lines of his own.* In page 21 of his "Letters" he refers me to page 66 of the same, from which he *takes seven lines* out of the middle and calls it "a *faithful copy, carefully transcribed* from the original, in Mr. Wesley's own hand writing." In page 23 of his Letters he refers me to page 55 of the same, which extract *I cannot find at all.*— Did I think it necessary I would go through the whole, but this is sufficient, methinks, to satisfy his *warmest friends*, and yet these books are sold publicly on the Lord's day at their Meeting Houses. Verily, John Wesley, thou wert a prophet indeed! Will the Conference suffer these things with impunity? Time will tell. Why did not Mr. N. throw some light upon his *forged* extracts from "Buchanan's Researches," from Burnett, Calvin, &c., &c? Poor man, he *could not.* May the Almighty look upon him in mercy, and forgive him.

---

*Previous to Mr. N. delivering his "Vindication," I proffered him my sermons that he might have the truth of what I said, but he refused them. The *truth* would not be palatable to him. He knows not its taste.

ERRATA.

In consequence of being obliged to use our type, we were compelled to go to press before some of the corrected proof sheets were returned by the Author, which has caused a few trifling typographical errors, for which we ask indulgence. All that are worthy of notice are as follows:—[PUELISHERS.

In page 7, 4 lines from top, for "corruption" read "corruptions."
In page 7, 29 lines from top, for 96, read 94.
In page 10, 21 lines from top, for "Bishop" read "Bishops."
In page 11, 18 lines from bottom, for "Francis Asbury in America" read "Francis Asbury,
In page 15, 27 lines from top, for "for the Methodists" read "from the Methodists."
then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America."
For "Elder" read "Presbyter" throughout, as per *note*.
In page 12, 18 lines from bottom, for "a Superintendent" read "as a Superintendent."
In page 14, 20 lines from bottom, for "brother Bishop" read "brother Bishops."
In page 28, 38 lines from top, add quotation mark after the word "Chronicle," and reverse the one after "ordination" in next line.

FEB 21/29